



FARM BUNGLING SOWS MORE TRAGEDY IN CHINA  
by Warren Unna  
The Washington Post June 24, 1962

Communist China, which has more people than any other country in the world and has had the longest struggle trying to keep them fed, may be experiencing a hunger convulsion that will shake the globe itself.

Since the beginning of its recorded history, China has referred to itself as "Chung Kuo," the Middle Kingdom about which all the rest of the universe revolved. In today's mid-20th century, she may not be exactly the center of the universe. But she undoubtedly has assumed the proportions of a dangerous nova whose explosive inner fires may send contamination hurtling about.

Because China's estimated 650 to 700 million people account for one fourth of the world's total, their hunger pains affect the world.

Inasmuch as China's Communist leaders openly boast that they have enough people to give them gambler's odds for outlasting the rest of the world in a nuclear war, their ambitions affect humanity.

And since China is groaning with lack of food and doctrinal and economic frustrations that may impel these leaders in Peking to take even more desperate measures for retaining control, China's state of content affects the world.

And this affection may assume obscure forms, as in the Canadian election last week, where Prime Minister John Diefenbaker was happy to campaign for increased wheat production in order to corral a farm vote that thinks it now has an unlimited buyer's market in wheat-short China.

An Emerging Pattern

But China, which always has had to battle floods, drought, insects and poor soil to grow enough food to fill many too many mouths, also has to contend with Communist economic doctrine.

By refusing entry to all but a handful of foreign journalists and by severely restricting the movements of foreign diplomats, China has kept the world in the dark as to her inner troubles. These troubles now, however, have reached the point where a number of specialists are beginning to see a pattern. The most notable recent account is an article entitled "The Famine Makers" by Valentin Chu, a China-born and educated journalist, which appeared in the June edition of the New Leader.

As Chou puts it: "The present famine is due not so much to sudden dramatic blows from nature as to the grave errors of a bureaucracy highly efficient in control but childishly lacking in common sense. A sizable portion of the floods and droughts which China has suffered during the past few years have been aggravated, and at times directly caused, by a decade of pseudoscientific methods in farming, irrigation and soil treatment... What China is now facing is no common natural disturbance, affecting a few provinces for a short time. It is a nation-wide exhaustion of the land and the people, the cumulative result of 12 years of abusing nature and human nature. Peking's search for a breakthrough in agriculture, has resulted in a breakdown."

### The Basic Problems

What have been the basic problems of China's farmer in his struggle to grow enough food, and how has Peking met them?

WATER--China has plenty of it, but in the wrong places. All of north China has less than 5 per cent of the river flow; the south 75 per cent.

First the Peking theoreticians, assisted by Soviet technicians, concentrated on big hydroelectric dams. Plans called for the Yellow River, the world's siltiest and perhaps its most unmanageable, to have some 60 dams in a TVA-like complex which by 1961 would both tame it and leave it crystal clear. By 1956, half of the high dams were completed, only to be destroyed by floods or silted up within months. In 1958 another flood proved that most of the uncontrolled water came from below the Sanmen Gorge where the key dam in the complex was being built. Water Conservation and Power, an official Communist Chinese technical journal, then acknowledged that the Yellow River project could not prevent major floods.

In central China's Anhwei Province, the Futseling reservoir and power plant first failed to keep the Huai River from overflowing its banks and then, because of overheavy sluice gates, was not in a position to disgorge the water when it was needed. The Yungting reservoir tunnel near Peking reportedly performed so badly that a subsequent flood inundated some 7 million acres and washed away some 2.6 million houses.

Construction of the Tahuofang dam in Manchuria, slated to provide China's second biggest reservoir, was curtailed in 1954 when it was discovered that the structure "had the consistency of rubber."

In June of 1959, Peking's official People's Daily conceded: "There are reservoirs without water; reservoirs with water, but without aqueducts." Water Conservation and Power added that many of the reservoirs "look all right as long as water is not let in."

In 1958, Peking decided to abandon its dam schemes in favor of irrigation canals. But the canals took away too much farmland, leaked, were often too small to hold their own against flood or drought and sometimes, by being dug too deep, drained the water table of the surrounding land and created a drought where none had existed. In north China, canal leaks succeeded in raising surrounding water tables to the point of forcing up harmful salts and alkali to the soil's crust. In April of 1961, the Kuang Ming Daily noted: "Arable land is continuously shrinking and alkalized soil spreading."

Approved For Release 2000/08/27 : CIA-RDP78-03061A000100070008-7  
Journalists and engineers. Peking has never had any overall water conservation plan. Technical direction often has not matched actual working conditions. Quality has always been less important than quantity and speed."

**REFORESTATION**--To help the hillsides retain their topsoil and to enhance the underground moisture capacity for water storage, Peking began a 12-year "green-up" program in 1956. One billion new trees a year were envisioned if 500 million farmers and school children planted two trees apiece. One "Green Wall" was to provide a 1000-mile windbreak from the Korean border to the Yangtze River; another in the north was to shield China from the sands of Outer Mongolia. The holes were dug, the saplings duly inserted. But the watering was neglected after the first few days and the green walls and forests withered. And along with the abortive reforestation program there has been a continuing deforestation practice. In 1958, during the backyard steel plant craze, nearby mountains were stripped for their wood fuel. Farm cooperatives and communes have allowed their cattle to graze on saplings. Timber industries, impressed with the patriotic need to meet their quotas, have hacked away indiscriminately without replanting.

**CULTIVATION**--When the Communists first seized power in the late 1940s, they thought they could yank the Chinese farmer into the 20th century with a massive farm mechanization program such as the United States has and the Soviet Union is trying to have.

But what tractors China managed to obtain proved of little help on the cut-up rice paddies or terraced hillside plots. Moreover, they fell in disrepair. Five years ago, the People's Daily declared: "It is too early to talk about general mechanization. We have no oil, too few animals. Steel is expensive. The cost of machinery is prohibitive."

Then came the semimechanized "Double-Wheel Double-Share Plow," a domestically produced, animal-drawn metal plow. It proved too heavy for the wet paddies and terraces and the factories often forgot to include all the parts. "Double-Wheel Double-Share" soon became known to the Chinese farmer as "Sleeping Plow."

More recently, there has been a new shift to handmade instruments. But a hoe made of "back-yard steel" and uncared for by a tired and unenthusiastic farmer, now may not last one season, instead of the traditional three generations.

Lacking the foreign exchange to import needed chemical fertilizers and kissing off the building of domestic fertilizer plants with too low a priority, China now finds itself still depending upon the traditional "night soil"--human waste. But this has proved insufficient, so the human waste now is mixed with sewage silt, river mud, peat, chimney ashes and industrial waste in order to produce a more impressive tonnage for Peking's statistics book.

When the Communist Party organization took over direct control of agriculture in 1958 it ordered half the cropland deep-plowed and close-sown. But this was done hastily, without concern for local conditions and without any coordination with fertilization. Crops weakened, soil was debilitated and, a year later, Peking decided it had lost more than it had gained.

This was also true of the "Battle of the Crops," an all-out scheme to boost agriculture, fishing, animal husbandry and forestry all at once. But when Peking decided to reverse itself to favor food crops over subsidiary ones, land which for centuries had tested out as good for cotton or tea of lychees or bamboo suddenly was forced into producing rice, wheat and potatoes.

This also disrupted such carefully worked-out cycles as the one in a silk producing village near Canton. Here the waste from the silkworms had been used to feed fish for an auxiliary income. The fish pond mud was dug up to fertilize the mulberry trees and the mulberry leaves, of course were fed the silkworms.

INSECTS--China's locusts reach unbelievable proportions. Yet when the first of the season's locusts were discovered in Honan Province in April of 1959 and duly reported to the Communist officials in the commune, the farmers were told their labor was more needed for weeding and fertilizing the crops.

Months later, the locusts had eaten their way through 48 counties in Honan, as well as some 179 counties, comprising 5 million acres of farmland, in Anhwei, Kiangsu and Shantung provinces. When the population was diverted to fight the locusts it was too late. And their inexperience in using spray killed a reported 100,000 farm animals.

And when Peking decided its "Swat-the-Fly" campaign was so successful it should be extended to such "predatory" birds as sparrows it suddenly found that knocking off the sparrows had brought an increase in the "predatory" insects the sparrows used to feed on.

POPULATIONS SHIFTS--When Peking got the notion that the way to leap-frog the Industrial Revolution was to encourage "back-yard" steel plants, small ovens for the forging of farm tools, Peking whistled for all available hands.

But, as Philip P. Jones and Thomas T. Poleman noted in the February issue of the Stanford University Food Research Institute Studies, "The steel campaign was short-lived. It seems clear that it resulted in colossal waste. If the employment figure of 100 million is to be credited, some 40 per cent of China's rural work force was diverted away from the fields during the height of the harvest season."

And when Peking had its try at Marxist purism with the commune, in which dormitory life replaced the farm family, the cranked-out enthusiasm leaped from recruitment to production figures. Grain production for 1958 was announced at 375 million tons, double the 1957 figures.

Said Jones and Poleman: "For a brief moment even the leadership apparently became mesmerized by such politically inspired production figures ... So optimistic were they that the top agricultural planners ordered a reduction in the area planted to fall-sown grains."

But then Premier Chou En-lai, in a recantation speech in 1959, explained that a "recount" showed grain production at 250 million tons, instead of 375 million, and that poor management in the commune mess halls had resulted in the farmers eating more of the harvest than usual.

Now the bitterly fought commune is reverting to the old brigade in which the farm team itself must be consulted on its production target and then permitted the capitalistic incentive of retaining for private resale whatever is produced above that target. The commune director still is around, however, and since his responsibilities now have been taken away he collides with the brigade director, who also is in charge.

Journalist Chu declares: "The more the peasants work under the party's blundering policy, of course, the less they produce. And the less they produce, the more they have to work. The end result is debilitating famine.

HEALTH--Although the world outside "Chung Kuo" may be concerned with what undernourishment may be doing to Chinese health, Peking considers this of secondary importance.

The People's Daily pronounced the dictum in late 1959: "The point of departure is production. It must be our unwavering determination in fighting pests and extinguishing diseases that this work shall be subservient to production. Public health as a purpose in itself--a bourgeois way of thinking--should not be permitted."

And it hasn't been. In the gong-beating marches which accompany the gathering of fertilizer, "night soil" now is handled in bare hands. Newspapers sometimes praise "fertilizer heroes" who patriotically refuse to wash their hands after work. Because of the fuel shortage, drinking water in the communes no longer is boiled, although it often comes from polluted sources.

All this has not been helped by the low food intake which Averell Harriman, United States Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, estimated two weeks ago to be around 1900 calories a day, compared with the 2300 considered minimal for a normal man in the Far East.

Dr. Stephen Wang, a 34-year-old Christian Chinese physician who fled to Hong Kong last month, declared in an interview. "Endemic malnutrition now makes most Chinese vulnerable to infection. We find the symptoms in every province where I have worked; both the very young and the older people have been weakened until their prospects for survival are poor.

"Almost the worst thing that can happen to a woman in China today is for her to learn that she is pregnant. Not enough food is available for her to nourish herself and the fetus. Should the child be born alive, it has little possibility of survival. The mother's breasts usually are dry. Even if she gets to a hospital there will be no milk. Most infants die within the first few months. When it happens many mothers are relieved."

Recently, Minister of Health, Li Techuan acknowledged that even three years ago there was a total of 70 million cases of schistosomiasis (enlargement of the liver and spleen), filariasis (parasitic worms in the blood), hookworms and malaria recorded for treatment.

DISTRIBUTION--China diverted her precious foreign exchange reserves from the purchase of industrial machinery to the purchase of some 6 million tons of feedstuffs last year--most of it grain, and another 3.5 million tons of grain so far this year.

But Hong Kong's Far Eastern Economic Review, in speculating over last month's exodus of refugees, declared:

"Several factors may be preventing these food resources from getting to the people. China may still, without advertising the fact, be supplying grain to Eastern Europe. The storage of grain in the provinces is not efficient and a proportion of it therefore does not keep. Transport remains poor. Perhaps the most convincing reason of all is that the Chinese government, anticipating further difficulties, is saving food for the future as hard as it can."

The United States, under the foreign aid authorization bill which recently cleared the Senate, would be forbidden either to give or to sell U. S. surplus food to governments dominated by either Marxism or communism unless the President makes a contrary decision.

Such rulings have been made in the past by looking the other way in regard to Communist Poland and Yugoslavia. But it is both impolitic and inconceivable for any present-day U. S. President to make such a finding in regard to Communist China.

And President Kennedy has indicated that he'll engage in no such transaction without specific congressional authorization. Authorities differ on whether the Senate amendment precludes famine relief to "people" as distinguished from "governments." Public Law 480 has hitherto provided for famine aid "to friendly but needy populations without regard to the friendliness of their government."

China's food problems certainly present her with a mammoth headache. But Administration experts in Washington now think her industrial breakdown, her shortfall of raw materials for factory parts, is providing Peking with an even bigger headache. And the current shift of population from the cities to the countryside to help with the food production has depleted the cities of their factory labor.

Seven years ago, before Walt W. Rostow had any thought of being in his present post of State Department counselor and chairman of the Policy Planning Council, noted in an article for Harper's magazine called "Marx Was a City Boy":

"A sustained failure of output to increase, or a substantial decrease, could create so vast a hunger in China that even a Communist control system could not prevent some kind of crisis... A demonstration that Communist techniques in Asia lead to chronic starvation could damage or destroy the powerful belief in underdeveloped areas that communism holds the key to rapid economic growth. It is this belief which is one of communism's greatest assets in the Cold War, in Southeast Asia, in the Middle East, in Africa and even in Latin America."

Well, last month's mass exodus of Chinese refugees to Hong Kong was one indication that the Communist control system was out of control. There are strong indications that a hunger convulsion is under way. Its contaminating--or perhaps purifying--qualities have yet to be seen.

Peking NCNA in English to Asia and Europe, 28 September 1962

Peking, 28 September--Following is the text of the communique of the 10th plenary session of the eighth Central Committee of the Communist Party of China:

The eighth Central Committee of the Communist Party of China held its 10th plenary session in Peking 24-27 September 1962.

The 10th plenary session was presided over by Comrade Mao Tse-tung. Eightytwo members and 88 alternate members of the Central Committee attended. Thirtythree other comrades from the departments concerned of the Central Committee and from the provincial municipal and autonomous region party committees were also present.

The 10th plenary session discussed and took decisions on the question of further consolidating the collective economy of the people's communes and developing agricultural production and on the question of commercial work. It made a decision on the planned interchange of important leading cadres of party and government organizations at various levels. It decided to strengthen the work of the party control commissions at all levels and elected additional members to the Central Control Commission.

It elected Comrades Lu Ting-i, Kang Sheng and Lo Jui-ching as additional members of the Secretariat of the Central Committee, and at the same time decided to dismiss Comrades Huang Ko-cheng and Tan Cheng from their posts as members of the Secretariat.

The 10th plenary session discussed the international and domestic situation.

The session points out that the international situation is developing in a direction even more favorable to the people of all countries. The struggle of the people of the world against the U.S. imperialist policies of aggression and war and against colonialism, old and new, is surging forward.

The Cuban people, after winning victory in their revolution, have embarked on the road of socialism and have continually defeated the U.S. imperialists' aggressive schemes. The Algerian people have attained independence through protracted armed struggle. In Laos, an armistice has been realized and a provisional coalition government has been formed. The people in southern Vietnam have won one victory after another in successful struggle for the recovery of West Irian. The Japanese people have conducted continued heroic struggles against U.S. imperialist aggression and oppression.

All these are important landmarks in the vigorous development of the national and democratic movements of the peoples of Asia, Africa, and Latin America. The struggles of the oppressed nations and peoples of the world for national independence, democracy, and socialism are playing an even greater role in the defense of world peace.

The growing strength of the countries in the socialist camp and their unity, based on Marxism-Leninism and internationalism, constitute the decisive factor in defending world peace and give extremely important encouragement and support to the liberation struggle of the people of various countries.

The U.S. imperialists are redoubling their efforts to push through their plans for aggression and war, which are aimed at attaining a world hegemony. The reactionaries of various countries are serving imperialism in a less disguised way. And the modern revisionists, represented by the Tito clique, have become more despicable in betraying the cause of communism and meeting the needs of imperialism. All this shows that the class struggle is raging in the international sphere.

The imperialists, the reactionaries of various countries, and the modern revisionists have engaged in all kinds of criminal activities to oppose communism, oppose the people, oppose the mass struggle of all oppressed nations, and oppose the People's Republic of China and all other independent countries in Asia, Africa, Latin America, and elsewhere, which refuse to be slaves, but the result is contrary to their expectations. Their criminal

-Continued-

activities have only served to further reveal their ugly features and land them in greater isolation. Although the struggle against the imperialists, the reactionaries of various countries, and the modern revisionists is protracted, tortuous, and complicated, the revolutionary cause of the people of all countries continues to develop, the international communist movement is growing daily in strength; and our friends have become more numerous.

The 10th plenary session holds that the development of the international situation has proved more convincingly that the general line of our country's foreign policy is entirely correct. This general line is: to develop relations of friendship, mutual assistance, and cooperation with the Soviet Union and the other fraternal socialist countries in accordance with the principle of proletarian internationalism; to strive for peaceful coexistence on the basis of the five principles with countries having differing social systems and to oppose the imperialist policies of aggression and war; and to support the revolutionary struggles of the oppressed peoples and oppressed nations against imperialism and colonialism.

We should continue to carry out this general line in international affairs in the future. We should continue to hold high the banner of opposing imperialism and defending world peace, and unite all the peace-loving countries and people of the world to form the broadest possible united front against U. S. and other imperialists and their running dogs in various countries.

We should continue to hold high the banner of revolution and give active support, to the liberation struggle of the peoples of various countries, especially the struggle of the Asian, African, and Latin American peoples for winning and safeguarding their national independence. We should continue to hold high the banner of proletarian internationalism and strive to safeguard and strengthen the unity of the socialist camp and the international communist movement.

We should continue to hold high the revolutionary principles of the 1957 Moscow Declaration and the 1960 Moscow Statement, and resolutely and thoroughly oppose modern revisionism--the main task at present and for a long time to come. At the same time, we should resolutely and thoroughly oppose dogmatism, oppose sectarianism, and oppose great-nation chauvinism and narrow nationalism. This is also a long-term task. The purpose of all this is to safeguard the purity of Marxism-Leninism.

The 10th plenary session notes with satisfaction that since the 9th plenary session, held in 1961, and particularly since the session at the beginning of this year, the work done by the whole party in implementing the policy of readjustment, consolidation, filling out, and raising standards in the national economy and in strengthening the agricultural front has yielded remarkable results despite the serious natural disasters for several consecutive years and shortcomings and mistakes in the work. The condition of the national economy last year was slightly better than the year before, and this year it is again slightly better than last year.

In agriculture, the actual harvest of summer crops this year has shown a slight gain over that of last year, and the yield of autumn crops is also expected to register an increase. This is the result of carrying through the party's series of policies concerning the rural people's communes and thus giving play to the advantages of the collective economy of the people's communes.

In industry, positive results have been achieved through the adoption of effective measures of readjustment. The output of means of production in support of agriculture, light industrial products using industrial products as raw material, many handicrafts, and some badly needed heavy industrial products has registered a considerable increase during the January-August period as compared with the corresponding period of last year. Many enterprises have improved their management. Their products are of a higher quality and cover a greater range, their production costs have been cut, and their labor productivity has risen.

In the field of commerce there are also new improvements, and the supply of commodities is slightly better than before. All this shows that, both in town and countryside, our economic conditions are getting better and better with each passing day.



It should be pointed out that some of our work is not well done. For instance, because of the incompetence of the leading cadres, some production teams, some factories, and some business establishments have produced less or become unwelcome to the masses. We should endeavor to change this state of affairs and improve the work of those units without delay.

The people of our country have always united closely around the Central Committee of the party and Comrade Mao Tse-tung. Even when confronted with serious difficulties at home and from abroad, the broadest masses and cadres of our country have always firmly believed in the correctness of the general line for socialist construction, the big leap forward, and the people's commune--the three red banners. Giving full play to the glorious tradition of working hard and building the country with diligence and thrift, and to the militant spirit of relying on our own efforts and working with vigor for the country's prosperity, they have actively grappled with the difficulties and scored brilliant achievements under the leadership of the party and the people's government.

The Chinese People's Liberation Army and the public security forces are strong and reliable armed forces of the people. Our country has also a heroic military force of vast numbers. They have performed well their glorious task of defending the motherland, the people's labor, and the socialist system. At all times they are vigilantly guarding the frontiers of our great motherland and protecting public order, and stand ready to smash the aggressive and sabotage activities of any enemy.

Tested in all these struggles, our country is worthy of being called a great country, our people a great people, our armed forces great armed forces, and our party a great party.

The imperialists, the reactionaries of various countries, and the modern revisionists gloated over the temporary difficulties encountered by the Chinese people, and they wantonly vilified China's general line for socialist countries, the big leap forward, and the people's commune, striking up an anti-Chinese chorus which was sensational for a time. U.S. imperialism instigated the Chiang Kai-shek gang entrenched in Taiwan to plot vainly an invasion of the coastal areas of the mainland. At home, those landlords, rich peasants, and bourgeois rightists who have not reformed themselves and the remnant counterrevolutionaries also gloated over our difficulties and tried to take advantage of the situation.

But the imperialists and their running dogs in China and abroad completely miscalculated. All their criminal activities have not only further exposed their hideous features, but have heightened the socialist and patriotic fervor of our people in working vigorously for the prosperity of our country. Our people have resolutely smashed and will continue to smash every one of these scheming activities, be it intrusion, provocation or aggression, or subversion within our state or the party.

The 10th plenary session of the eighth Central Committee points out that throughout the historical period of proletarian revolution and proletarian dictatorship, throughout the historical period of transition from capitalism to communism--which will last scores of years or even longer--there is class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie and struggle between the socialist road and the capitalist road. The reactionary ruling classes which have been overthrown are not reconciled to their doom. They always attempt to stage a comeback.

Meanwhile, there still exist in society bourgeois influences, the force of habit of the old society, and a spontaneous tendency toward capitalism among some of the small producers. Therefore, among the people a small number of persons making up only a tiny fraction of the total population who have not yet undergone socialist remolding always attempt to depart from the socialist road and turn to the capitalist road whenever there is an opportunity. Class struggle is inevitable under these circumstances. This is a law of history which has long been elucidated by Marxism-Leninism. We must never forget it.

This class struggle is complicated, tortuous, with ups and downs, and sometimes it is very sharp. This class struggle inevitably finds expression within the party. Pressure from foreign imperialism and the existence of bourgeois influences at home constitute the social source of revisionist ideas

Approved For Release 2000/08/27 : CIA-RDP78-03061A000100070008-7  
in the party. While urging the party to remain vigilant and resolutely oppose in good time various enemies, we must remain vigilant and resolutely oppose in good time various opportunist ideological tendencies in the party. The great historic significance of the eighth plenary session of the eighth Central Committee, held in Lushan in August 1959, lies in the fact that it victoriously smashed attacks by right opportunism and revisionism and safeguarded the party line and the unity of the party.

At present and in the future, our party must sharpen its vigilance and correctly wage a struggle on two fronts, against revisionism and against dogmatism. Only thus can the purity of Marxism-Leninism be always preserved, the unity of the party constantly strengthened, and the fighting power of the party continuously increased.

The 10th plenary session holds that the urgent task facing the people of our country at present is to carry through the general policy of developing the national economy, with agriculture as the foundation and industry the leading factor. As put forward by Comrade Mao Tse-tung, attach first importance to the development of agriculture, correctly handle the relationship between industry and agriculture, and resolutely readjust the work of the industrial departments according to the policy of making agriculture the foundation of the national economy.

In the field of agriculture, it is necessary to continue to carry out the Central Committee's various policies concerning the people's communes, consolidate still further the collective economy, bring the peasants' enthusiasm for collective production into still greater play, give priority to the development of grain production, and at the same time strive to develop cotton, oil-bearing, and other industrial crops as well as livestock breeding, aquatic production, forestry and side occupations. Meanwhile, it is necessary to mobilize and concentrate the strength of the whole party and the whole nation in an active way to give agriculture and the collective economy of the people's communes every possible material, technical, and financial aid as well as aid in the fields of leadership and personnel, and to bring about the technical transformation of agriculture, stage by stage and in a manner suited to local conditions.

In the field of industry, the first thing to do is--in accordance with the needs of the technical transformation of agriculture and the present availability of materials and manpower--to further carry out national readjustment, strengthen the productive capacity of the weaker departments, energetically improve management, and increase the variety and raise the quality of products.

In the field of commerce, it is necessary--in accordance with the principle of "insuring supplies by increasing production"--and the policy of commerce serving agricultural and industrial production and the livelihood of the people through the channels of state-run commerce, cooperative commerce, and village fair trade--to make great efforts to arrange for the interflow of farm produce and manufactured goods between the rural and urban areas so as to supply the rural areas with more means of production, supply industry with more materials, and supply the urban and rural people with more daily necessities.

In the fields of science, culture, and education, it is necessary to strengthen scientific and technological research and particularly to pay attention to scientific and technological research in agriculture, vigorously train personnel in these fields, at the same time strengthen the work of uniting with and educating the intellectuals so that they may play their role fully, as they should. Although we have produced more goods both last year and this year and the living conditions of the people have improved, the goods we produce are still insufficient and the whole nation must strive to expand production, insure the supply of goods, and so gradually improve the livelihood of the people. At the same time, the urban and rural inhabitants of the whole country must give attention to diligence and thrift in construction work and housekeeping, practice economy, and lay up some savings so that we may gradually be better off and be prepared against the needs caused by natural disasters and other unforeseen events.

The 10th plenary session is firmly convinced that, though certain difficulties still exist, it is entirely possible to overcome them. We have already made great achievements. Our future is bright provided the whole party and the whole nation, united as one, strengthen democratic centralism, carry through the general policy of developing the national economy with agriculture as the foundation and industry as the leading factor, and further conscientiously carry out the work of readjustment, consolidation, filling out, and raising standards in the national economy. We will certainly be able, after making efforts for a period of time, to usher in a new period of great upsurge in our country's socialist construction.

The 10th plenary session calls on the workers, peasants, intellectuals, democratic parties, and patriots of all nationalities throughout the country to unite even more closely, hold still higher the glorious banners of the general line for socialist construction, the big leap forward, and the people's commune under the leadership of the party's Central Committee and Comrade Mao Tse-tung, go all out in their efforts to increase production and practice economy, and strive for a bumper harvest next year, for the new growth of the national economy and for new victories in the socialist cause of our country.

RED STAR Moscow, 22 September 1962

Soviet military scientific thought has always paid much attention to questions of military theory. In the last few years a number of major works have been published on the theory of combat and operations. For a long time, however, no such works have been published on the highest level of the military art--strategy. The last major work devoted to problems of military strategy in general, A. Svechin's "Strategy," was published as long ago as 1926.

That is why publication of the book, "Military Strategy," written by an author collective under the leadership of Marshal of the Soviet Union V.D. Skolovski and issued by the military publishing house, is a very pleasant event. This substantial, valuable work of scientific research not only fills a known gap in our military-theoretical literature, it also represents a remarkable contribution to the development of the theory of the military art.

The work is composed of eight chapters. They review in detail all major problems of strategy. Stressing the class nature of bourgeois and Soviet military strategy, the authors outline the interrelation between military strategy, politics, economy, and the moral-political factor, and show the essence of military doctrine and its dominating role over military strategy. The book reviews in detail the reactionary nature of the military strategy of the contemporary imperialist states--aimed at a third world war which is being prepared by them. The authors outline the road of development of Soviet military strategy.

A large part of the book consists of a profound, substantial analysis of the concrete questions which come under military strategy: the character of contemporary war, the organization of the armed forces, the means of waging war, the preparations of the country for repelling aggression, and the leadership of armed forces. On the whole the structure of the book can be termed successful. The contents of the book also command attention. It contains the substantiation of a whole series of new conclusions and tenets applied to the conditions of contemporary rocket-nuclear war.

The historic 22d CPSU Congress made an outstanding contribution to the theory of Marxism-Leninism and to its composite part--the Marxist-Leninist teaching on war and the army.

The CPSU Program and the CPSU statutes, the reports and the concluding speech of N.S. Khrushchev contain a profound illumination of many aspects of the activities of our party for the strengthening of the defense capacity of the Soviet state and the defense of the countries of the socialist camp against imperialist aggression. Another development of Soviet military theory was the well-known decision of the fourth session of the USSR Supreme Soviet of the fifth convocation. The basic tenets of Soviet military doctrine as formulated in the materials of the 22d CPSU Congress and the fourth session of the USSR Supreme Soviet were the basis for the work reviewed here.

Based on these tenets, the authors expose with great force and conviction, while analyzing the military strategy of the imperialist states, the aggressive nature of imperialism and primarily that of American imperialism, stressing the consolidation under the latter sponsorship of all imperialist forces against the Soviet Union and other countries of the socialist camp.

The mightiest military power of the capitalist world--the United States--is exerting on its partners in military blocs political and military pressure and is leading them along the path of preparing aggression against the socialist countries. It is continuously stepping up its military potential and rearming its forces with the newest means of combat and technical equipment. Its calculations are based on the preparation of mighty and technically well-equipped armed force ready for a surprise attack. Such a strategy of imperialism can lead at any moment to war with the utilization of the most modern means of combat.

In contrast to the strategy of the imperialist states, which is reactionary throughout and aggressive in its spirit and content, Soviet military strategy, as stressed by the authors, serves the most advanced and progressive social regime. Its efforts are not directed at attacking someone but at protecting our country and other socialist countries against imperialist aggression. In this connection, the working out of means for reliably repelling a surprise nuclear attack by an aggressor is the main problem of Soviet military strategy.

CONTINUED

The authors show in detail on the basis of extensive historical material how strategic views on the character and the means of armed struggle have changed in the Soviet Army, how the art of strategic leadership has been perfected. They show the leading role of the Communist Party and its Central Committee in determining the political goals of the strategy and leadership on the armed forces. The book states that in the years of the civil and the great fatherland wars the party Central Committee was the militant staff and the true organizer and inspirer of the Soviet people in the struggle against the interventionists.

The Central Committee reviewed all major questions of the organization and strengthening of the armed forces, the strategic war plans, the establishment and distribution of reserves, the appointment of commanders, and so on.

The historical approach to the analysis of questions of strategy undoubtedly facilitates the understanding of the contemporary state of the theory of Soviet military strategy. At the same time one wishes to note that, in our opinion, the authors should have shown more extensively the people who took a direct part in the working out of the strategic theory, strategic planning and leadership, and the continuity of the best traditions of the Russian National Military School.

The foundation of the military theory of the Soviet state and the inexhaustible source of its development is the tremendous legacy left by V.I. Lenin regarding the strategic leadership of the armed struggle in the period of the civil war and the foreign military intervention and the rich fountain of wisdom of the Leninist military-theoretical views.

A tremendous contribution to the theory of strategy was made by such prominent military functionaries of our party and state as M.V. Frunze, B.M. Shaposhnikov, and M.N. Tukhachevskiy. A certain influence of the development of the military-strategic thought in the Soviet Army came also from the prominent military theoreticians A.A. Svechin, A.A. Neznamov, V.K. Triandafillov, and E.A. Shilovskiy. Great work on this problem is being done by S.N. Krasilnikov and others.

In outlining the questions of the development of Soviet military strategy, the authors of the book should as a matter of course have mentioned these names. This would have enriched the work and would have promoted the correction of the situation which existed during the period of the personality cult when everything new and progressive in military theory was attributed to Stalin alone.

The book devotes considerable space to the Marxist-Leninist analysis of the character of contemporary war and to the influence which the contemporary means of armed struggle have on it.

"One of the important tenets of Soviet military doctrine," stress the authors, "is that a world war, if it is unleashed by the imperialists, will inevitably assume the character of a rocket-nuclear war. That means the character of a war in which the main means of destruction will be nuclear weapons and the basic vehicles for carrying them to the target will be rockets."

As is known, the character of the armed struggle is influenced not only by the means with which it is waged, but also the social nature of the war. The new world war, if unleashed by the imperialists, will be characterized by the participation of two opposing worldwide social systems--the capitalist and the socialist system. This very fact will determine the resoluteness and fierceness of the war.

The problem of its duration is of great importance for understanding the character of future war. On the basis of research, the authors arrive at the conclusion that in a future war, one must base one's calculations for victory (vesti raschet na pobedu) over the aggressor on the shortest possible time. In this connection, as pointed out by USSR Minister of Defense Marshal of the Soviet Union R. Ya. Malinovskiy, the initial period will be of decisive importance for the outcome of the whole war.

Of indisputable scientific interest are the recommendations of the authors regarding the organization (stroitelstv) of the armed forces. They stress that the basic means for speedily defeating and putting out of the war whole countries are rocket-nuclear weapons. They determine also at present the main direction in the organization of the armed forces and in the means of waging a future war. "Nuclear weapons," says the book, "represent already at present the basic firepower of all branches of armed forces. The creation of superiority over the enemy regarding this weapon and the means of its utilization are the most important task of the organization of the armed forces in times of peace as well as in the course of war."

These conclusions reflect correctly the basic direction of the organization of armed forces in modern conditions. We think only that the authors should have developed in this chapter the relationship between different forces and services as well as the basic principles of their organizational structure and buildup.

One cannot agree fully with the authors' opinions about strategic maneuvering. The book points out that "strategic maneuvering (manevr) in conditions of rocket-nuclear war can be defined as shifting of efforts from one strategic direction or objective to another mainly through the fire maneuverability (ognevogo manevra) of the nuclear weapon." The authors recognize the maneuvering of forces and materials only within the theater of battle and mainly on the operational scale. In addition they omit the obvious truth that no single grouping of troops can be carried out in the war plan both before the beginning and in the course of war without maneuvering with forces and materials. Strategic transfers of forces and materials to theaters of action for supplementing or replacing definite groupings also cannot be excluded.

Naturally the country preparing for war will develop its forces and materials in such a way as to start action with the existing grouping. But even this grouping cannot be created without preliminary maneuvers on a strategic and operational scale. And if we take into account that as a result of the first nuclear strikes military groupings may be considerably weakened, or that the first strategic echelon in the definite theater of military operation may suffer great losses, then it will appear obvious that there is a necessity for strategic maneuverability of sources and materials--something which the authors of this work do not mention for some reason.

An important place in the book is given to describing the methods of warfare on a strategic scale. A new classification of types of strategic operations is given. The authors consider that all strategic operations by the armed forces in a future war will boil down to the following: "Rocket-nuclear strikes with the aim of destroying and annihilating objectives making up the foundation of the military-economic potential of the enemy, damage to the system of state and military administration, destruction of strategic nuclear materials and main military groupings, military operations against land theaters of war with the aim of completing the destruction of enemy forces, protection of the rear of the socialist countries and military groupings from enemy nuclear attacks, and military operations in maritime theaters of war with the aim of destroying the naval forces of the enemy."

The concrete recommendations by the authors regarding the methods of conducting rocket-nuclear war represent a great scientific interest and deserve diligent attention. It must be noted, however, that the authors, having here justifiably concentrated their main attention on the rocket forces for strategic purposes, have not given sufficient weight to and have not analyzed deeply enough the role and methods of operations of other types of armed forces, particularly of the land troops.

In the chapter dealing with opinions on the methods of warfare, the authors examine also such an important problem as the use of outer space for military purposes. They cite a number of facts showing that American imperialists have entered the path of direct use of the cosmos for carrying out their aggressive aims directed against the socialist countries. The American press openly speaks about "outer space being the strategic theater of tomorrow."

The Soviet people are occupied in peaceful exploitation of the cosmos. The flights of our cosmonauts Yu. Gagarin, G. Titov, A. Nikolayev, and P. Popovich, which have amazed the whole world, as is known, did not pursue any military aims. But it is quite obvious that if the imperialists continue to search for ways of using outer space for military purposes, then the interests of insuring the security of the Soviet state will require the necessary measures by our side as well, the Soviet military strategic thought the problem of using outer space for forestalling the aggressive aims of the imperialists should be taken into account.

The reader will find Chapter VII on "preparation of the country for repelling aggression" an interesting one. This chapter considers the main problems of such preparation, giving a general picture of the character of the measures taken by our country for strengthening its defense capacity. The authors draw a number of important practical conclusions. They justly note in particular that "in contrast to the covering forces (sil prikrytiya) of former wars, the combat-ready part of the land forces must in modern conditions be numerically much stronger to be capable of executing its assignments." In our opinion their recommendations on simplifying mobilization, on utilizing motor transport and

In the last chapter of the book the authors, using considerable historical material, show how strategic leadership of the armed forces was carried out in the World War II by the capitalist states, and what is the basis of the leadership of the armed forces at the present time. They give an evaluation of the good and bad aspects of such leadership.

The structure and functions of the higher organs of leadership of the Soviet armed forces during the Civil War, in the period of peace, and during the Great Fatherland War are examined in detail. A conclusion is drawn on the basis of this that "the principles of the unity of leadership of the conduct of armed struggle in the political, economic and military respects, centralization of the leadership of the armed forces with a wise combination of collegiality and personal responsibility of the leaders--principles which were worked out and tested in practice in our country--are fully valid in modern conditions." The book shows in general outlines the possible organs of leadership of the armed forces of the Soviet Union in conditions of a modern war.

In the concluding chapter, the authors examine briefly the questions of the leadership by the Communist Party of the Soviet armed forces and the principles of party-political work.

Unfortunately these important problems are examined very lightly and superficially. Individual confused statements are made which in fact distort the question of the role of the party organizations in the Soviet Army. It appears that the authors of this section did not think enough about the tenet of the new statute of the CPSU which states that "the party organizations of the Soviet army insure the implementation of the party policy in the armed forces . . . ." (Ellipsis as printed)

There is no possibility in the framework of a newspaper article to examine such a large number of problems as are raised in the book "Military Strategy." We cannot express our agreement with the authors on a number of these problems apart from those examined above. These problems deserve a special discussion. But on the whole I would like to stress once again that a necessary and valuable military-technical work has been published, both in content and significance. The broad Soviet regarding public will undoubtedly find in this book much that is interesting and new. The work will be of undoubted profit to all generals and officers of the Soviet Army and will be an important handbook in their military-theoretical training.

RED STAR Moscow, 22 September 1962

Soviet military scientific thought has always paid much attention to questions of military theory. In the last few years a number of major works have been published on the theory of combat and operations. For a long time, however, no such works have been published on the highest level of the military art--strategy. The last major work devoted to problems of military strategy in general, A. Svechin's "Strategy," was published as long ago as 1926.

That is why publication of the book, "Military Strategy," written by an author collective under the leadership of Marshal of the Soviet Union V. D. Skolovskiy and issued by the military publishing house, is a very pleasant event. This substantial, valuable work of scientific research not only fills a known gap in our military-theoretical literature, it also represents a remarkable contribution to the development of the theory of the military art.

The work is composed of eight chapters. They review in detail all major problems of strategy. Stressing the class nature of bourgeois and Soviet military strategy, the authors outline the interrelation between military strategy, politics, economy, and the moral-political factor, and show the essence of military doctrine and its dominating role over military strategy. The book reviews in detail the reactionary nature of the military strategy of the contemporary imperialist states--aimed at a third world war which is being prepared by them. The authors outline the road of development of Soviet military strategy.

A large part of the book consists of a profound, substantial analysis of the concrete questions which come under military strategy: the character of contemporary war, the organization of the armed forces, the means of waging war, the preparations of the country for repelling aggression, and the leadership of armed forces. On the whole the structure of the book can be termed successful. The contents of the book also command attention. It contains the substantiation of a whole series of new conclusions and tenets applied to the conditions of contemporary rocket-nuclear war.

The historic 22d CPSU Congress made an outstanding contribution to the theory of Marxism-Leninism and to its composite part--the Marxist-Leninist teaching on war and the army.

The CPSU Program and the CPSU statutes, the reports and the concluding speech of N. S. Khrushchev contain a profound illumination of many aspects of the activities of our party for the strengthening of the defense capacity of the Soviet state and the defense of the countries of the socialist camp against imperialist aggression. Another development of Soviet military theory was the well-known decision of the fourth session of the USSR Supreme Soviet of the fifth convocation. The basic tenets of Soviet military doctrine as formulated in the materials of the 22d CPSU Congress and the fourth session of the USSR Supreme Soviet were the basis for the work reviewed here.

Based on these tenets, the authors expose with great force and conviction, while analyzing the military strategy of the imperialist states, the aggressive nature of imperialism and primarily that of American imperialism, stressing the consolidation under the latter sponsorship of all imperialist forces against the Soviet Union and other countries of the socialist camp.

The mightiest military power of the capitalist world--the United States--is exerting on its partners in military blocs political and military pressure and is leading them along the path of preparing aggression against the socialist countries. It is continuously stepping up its military potential and rearming its forces with the newest means of combat and technical equipment. Its calculations are based on the preparation of mighty and technically well-equipped armed force ready for a surprise attack. Such a strategy of imperialism can lead at any moment to war with the utilization of the most modern means of combat.

In contrast to the strategy of the imperialist states, which is reactionary throughout and aggressive in its spirit and content, Soviet military strategy, as stressed by the authors, serves the most advanced and progressive social regime. Its efforts are not directed at attacking someone but at protecting our country and other socialist countries against imperialist aggression. In this connection, the working out of means for reliably repelling a surprise nuclear attack by an aggressor is the main problem of Soviet military strategy.

CONTINUED



The authors show in detail on the basis of extensive historical material how strategic views on the character and the means of armed struggle have changed in the Soviet Army, how the art of strategic leadership has been perfected. They show the leading role of the Communist Party and its Central Committee in determining the political goals of the strategy and leadership on the armed forces. The book states that in the years of the civil and the great fatherland wars the party Central Committee was the militant staff and the true organizer and inspirer of the Soviet people in the struggle against the interventionists.

The Central Committee reviewed all major questions of the organization and strengthening of the armed forces, the strategic war plans, the establishment and distribution of reserves, the appointment of commanders, and so on.

The historical approach to the analysis of questions of strategy undoubtedly facilitates the understanding of the contemporary state of the theory of Soviet military strategy. At the same time one wishes to note that, in our opinion, the authors should have shown more extensively the people who took a direct part in the working out of the strategic theory, strategic planning and leadership, and the continuity of the best traditions of the Russian National Military School.

The foundation of the military theory of the Soviet state and the inexhaustible source of its development is the tremendous legacy left by V.I. Lenin regarding the strategic leadership of the armed struggle in the period of the civil war and the foreign military intervention and the rich fountain of wisdom of the Leninist military-theoretical views.

A tremendous contribution to the theory of strategy was made by such prominent military functionaries of our party and state as M.V. Frunze, B.M. Shaposhnikov, and M.N. Tukhachevskiy. A certain influence of the development of the military-strategic thought in the Soviet Army came also from the prominent military theoreticians A.A. Svechin, A.A. Neznamov, V.K. Triandafillov, and E.A. Shilovskiy. Great work on this problem is being done by S.N. Krasilnikov and others.

In outlining the questions of the development of Soviet military strategy, the authors of the book should as a matter of course have mentioned these names. This would have enriched the work and would have promoted the correction of the situation which existed during the period of the personality cult when everything new and progressive in military theory was attributed to Stalin alone.

The book devotes considerable space to the Marxist-Leninist analysis of the character of contemporary war and to the influence which the contemporary means of armed struggle have on it.

"One of the important tenets of Soviet military doctrine," stress the authors, "is that a world war, if it is unleashed by the imperialists, will inevitably assume the character of a rocket-nuclear war. That means the character of a war in which the main means of destruction will be nuclear weapons and the basic vehicles for carrying them to the target will be rockets."

As is known, the character of the armed struggle is influenced not only by the means with which it is waged, but also the social nature of the war. The new world war, if unleashed by the imperialists, will be characterized by the participation of two opposing worldwide social systems--the capitalist and the socialist system. This very fact will determine the resoluteness and fierceness of the war.

The problem of its duration is of great importance for understanding the character of future war. On the basis of research, the authors arrive at the conclusion that in a future war, one must base one's calculations for victory (vesti raschet na pobedu) over the aggressor on the shortest possible time. In this connection, as pointed out by USSR Minister of Defense Marshal of the Soviet Union R. Ya Malinovskiy, the initial period will be of decisive importance for the outcome of the whole war.

Of indisputable scientific interest are the recommendations of the authors regarding the organization (stroitelstv) of the armed forces. They stress that the basic means for speedily defeating and putting out of the war whole countries are rocket-nuclear weapons. They determine also at present the main direction in the organization of the armed forces and in the means of waging a future war. "Nuclear weapons," says the book, "represent already at present the basic firepower of all branches of armed forces. The creation of superiority over the enemy regarding this weapon and the means of its utilization are the most important task of the organization of the armed forces in times of peace as well as in the course of war."

These conclusions reflect correctly the basic direction of the organization of armed forces in modern conditions. We think only that the authors should have developed in this chapter the relationship between different forces and services as well as the basic principles of their organizational structure and buildup.

One cannot agree fully with the authors' opinions about strategic maneuvering. The book points out that "strategic maneuvering (manevr) in conditions of rocket-nuclear war can be defined as shifting of efforts from one strategic direction or objective to another mainly through the fire maneuverability (ognevoe manevra) of the nuclear weapon." The authors recognize the maneuvering of forces and materials only within the theater of battle and mainly on the operational scale. In addition they omit the obvious truth that no single grouping of troops can be carried out in the war plan both before the beginning and in the course of war without maneuvering with forces and materials. Strategic transfers of forces and materials to theaters of action for supplementing or replacing definite groupings also cannot be excluded.

Naturally the country preparing for war will develop its forces and materials in such a way as to start action with the existing grouping. But even this grouping cannot be created without preliminary maneuvers on a strategic and operational scale. And if we take into account that as a result of the first nuclear strikes military groupings may be considerably weakened, or that the first strategic echelon in the definite theater of military operation may suffer great losses, then it will appear obvious that there is a necessity for strategic maneuverability of sources and materials--something which the authors of this work do not mention for some reason.

An important place in the book is given to describing the methods of warfare on a strategic scale. A new classification of types of strategic operations is given. The authors consider that all strategic operations by the armed forces in a future war will boil down to the following: "Rocket-nuclear strikes with the aim of destroying and annihilating objectives making up the foundation of the military-economic potential of the enemy, damage to the system of state and military administration, destruction of strategic nuclear materials and main military groupings, military operations against land theaters of war with the aim of completing the destruction of enemy forces, protection of the rear of the socialist countries and military groupings from enemy nuclear attacks, and military operations in maritime theaters of war with the aim of destroying the naval forces of the enemy."

The concrete recommendations by the authors regarding the methods of conducting rocket-nuclear war represent a great scientific interest and deserve diligent attention. It must be noted, however, that the authors, having here justifiably concentrated their main attention on the rocket forces for strategic purposes, have not given sufficient weight to and have not analyzed deeply enough the role and methods of operations of other types of armed forces, particularly of the land troops.

In the chapter dealing with opinions on the methods of warfare, the authors examine also such an important problem as the use of outer space for military purposes. They cite a number of facts showing that American imperialists have entered the path of direct use of the cosmos for carrying out their aggressive aims directed against the socialist countries. The American press openly speaks about "outer space being the strategic theater of tomorrow."

The Soviet people are occupied in peaceful exploitation of the cosmos. The flights of our cosmonauts Yu. Gagarin, G. Titov, A. Nikolayev, and P. Popovich, which have amazed the whole world, as is known, did not pursue any military aims. But it is quite obvious that if the imperialists continue to search for ways of using outer space for military purposes, then the interests of insuring the security of the Soviet state will require the necessary measures by our side as well, the Soviet military strategic thought the problem of using outer space for forestalling the aggressive aims of the imperialists should be taken into account.

The reader will find Chapter VII on "preparation of the country for repelling aggression" an interesting one. This chapter considers the main problems of such preparation, giving a general picture of the character of the measures taken by our country for strengthening its defense capacity. The authors draw a number of important practical conclusions. They justly note in particular that "in contrast to the covering forces (sil prikrytiya) of former wars, the combat-ready part of the land forces must in modern conditions be numerically much stronger to be capable of executing its assignments." In our opinion their recommendations on simplifying mobilization, on utilizing motor transport and

In the last chapter of the book the authors, using considerable historical material, show how strategic leadership of the armed forces was carried out in the World War II by the capitalist states, and what is the basis of the leadership of the armed forces at the present time. They give an evaluation of the good and bad aspects of such leadership.

The structure and functions of the higher organs of leadership of the Soviet armed forces during the Civil War, in the period of peace, and during the Great Fatherland War are examined in detail. A conclusion is drawn on the basis of this that "the principles of the unity of leadership of the conduct of armed struggle in the political, economic and military respects, centralization of the leadership of the armed forces with a wise combination of collegiality and personal responsibility of the leaders--principles which were worked out and tested in practice in our country--are fully valid in modern conditions." The book shows in general outlines the possible organs of leadership of the armed forces of the Soviet Union in conditions of a modern war.

In the concluding chapter, the authors examine briefly the questions of the leadership by the Communist Party of the Soviet armed forces and the principles of party-political work.

Unfortunately these important problems are examined very lightly and superficially. Individual confused statements are made which in fact distort the question of the role of the party organizations in the Soviet Army. It appears that the authors of this section did not think enough about the tenet of the new statute of the CPSU which states that "the party organizations of the Soviet army insure the implementation of the party policy in the armed forces . . . ." (Ellipsis as printed)

There is no possibility in the framework of a newspaper article to examine such a large number of problems as are raised in the book "Military Strategy." We cannot express our agreement with the authors on a number of these problems apart from those examined above. These problems deserve a special discussion. But on the whole I would like to stress once again that a necessary and valuable military-technical work has been published, both in content and significance. The broad Soviet regarding public will undoubtedly find in this book much that is interesting and new. The work will be of undoubted profit to all generals and officers of the Soviet Army and will be an important handbook in their military-theoretical training.

"A GREAT BETRAYAL OF MARXISM-LENINISM"

Zeri I Popullit  
Tirana, Albania  
October 13, 1962

Soviet President Brezhnev recently made an 11-day official visit to Yugoslavia at the invitation of Tito. The Soviet and Yugoslav press announced that Brezhnev's visit was in response to the one made by Tito to the USSR in 1956.

At Moscow airport he was seen off by Khrushchev. Upon his arrival in Belgrade, where he was given a great welcome by Tito and his clique, Brezhnev hastened to express to "esteemed Comrade Tito" his gratitude for this friendly invitation and to convey to him, on behalf of N.S. Khrushchev, "cordial greetings and good wishes for success in his life and work, in the struggle for a long peace and for socialism."

During the visit the two presidents made many speeches. In them Tito hastened to express his great joy at being able to show Comrade Brezhnev "the results attained in the development and construction of socialism in Yugoslavia" under the guidance of the League of Yugoslav Communists. He said that "the existence of certain differences must not be an obstacle along this road, inasmuch as they represent a natural phenomenon which frequently in today's world is engendered by the fact that the concrete paths followed by the economic and social rise of different countries are different, due to differing historical and other conditions." Tito dealt with the aid and support Yugoslavia has offered to the national and progressive liberation movements throughout the world and in the independent countries of Asia and Africa.

He proclaimed loudly in front of the President of the Supreme Soviet that "the attitude of the Yugoslav Government and that of the USSR Government either coincide or are identical on a number of fundamental international questions." Recalling the time when a certain obscurity reigned in USSR-Yugoslav relations, Tito said: "There is no need for us to insult each other. We must put an end to this once and for all and become good friends. I am convinced that your visit is a great step forward in the development of relations between our two countries."

In his speech at Kragujevac, Tito said: "We can tell our friends frankly that they have come to a country where socialism is being built and where there cannot be another road of development. We shall continue to advance along this path; we have something to build--our socialist regime. (Note well, he did not speak about American "aid".) In conclusion I would like to thank Comrade Brezhnev and our other friends for the visit they have paid and for the words they have spoken, which are in complete accord with our views of socialism."

In his turn President Brezhnev praised Tito's speeches and made several statements. During his first speech on 24 September, and many times later, he repeated that "cooperation with Yugoslavia is in the interests of all countries building socialism and communism." After indicating that the field of activities in Soviet-Yugoslav relations is vast, he continued: "We greatly appreciate the efforts made by the government, and personally by President Tito, toward a policy of peace and cooperation among states." During a speech made at a meeting in Split, Brezhnev spoke to "the Yugoslav comrades" about the liquidation of the personality cult and its odious consequences. He underlined that "the uncovering and bold unmasking of the personality cult of Stalin and its condemnation was of tremendous importance for the successful building of a communist society." Here Brezhnev also gave his impression of the construction of socialism in Yugoslavia by saying that "we have seen how the peoples of Yugoslavia are working as a fraternal and united family in the construction of their new life." He often mentioned his "interesting and valuable conversations" with President Tito and other eminent Yugoslav personalities, and "the interesting things he had seen," as well as the "interesting trip" he made across Yugoslavia.

The most important person among those accompanying the Soviet President on his trip across the country was A. Rankovic, known for organizing the tortures and killings of thousands of Yugoslav communists who have had the courage to oppose the revisionist course of the Tito clique since 1948.

In taking "cordial" leave of Tito, Brezhnev spoke once more about "the sincere conversations" he had had with him on many problems "concerning the joint struggle for peace and the general development of Soviet-Yugoslav relations in

-Continued-

the interests of peace and socialism." He once more "warmly thanked" his "dear friend, the President of the republic, Comrade Tito," and on behalf of Khrushchev, begged him to pay a visit to the Soviet Union. According to Tass, Tito accepted this invitation with satisfaction and said he would visit N. Khrushchev in December.

BORBA, speaking with frenzied joy about Brezhnev's visit, said: "The friendly relations and fruitful cooperation between the USSR and Yugoslavia will no doubt become established for a long time, will become stable and continue improving."

That is what was said publicly. But what attracts attention is what was not said or what was evaded intentionally, both in the speeches and the published communique. We do not want to talk about the secret talks which have been in progress for a long time between the group of N. Khrushchev and Tito, of their plans to cooperate and coordinate their secessionist activities. Time will reveal the secrets, as has happened on earlier occasions.

We want to speak about the questions on which silence is being maintained, or which are being approached in a twisted manner. Anyone who has followed Brezhnev's trip from the beginning and carefully read the final communique on the Tito-Brezhnev talks will note that the danger that American imperialism presents to peace, to the national independence of peoples, and to socialism was not stressed; that the illusion has been created that the time has come when the imperialists will, as a result of disarmament, transfer large funds to the development of the well-being of people, and particularly in underdeveloped countries; that when speaking of Cuba, the finger is not pointed at American imperialism, which is threatening that country with aggression, but mention is only made of some aggressive circles of imperialism; that when speaking about the admission of the CPR to the United Nations, nobody recalls the necessity of driving the Chiang Kai-shek clique from the United Nations, that the imperialist policy of "two China's" is not condemned, etc.

It therefore appears that Brezhnev's visit, the visit of N. Khrushchev's personal envoy to Tito, was not a simple and ordinary trip to see "beautiful and wondrous parts of Yugoslavia," in spite of the efforts made to keep it officially within the framework of peaceful coexistence and relations between states. This visit was paid only a short time after N. Khrushchev's speech at Varna in Bulgaria, where he eulogized the Tito clique "which is building socialism," where he characterized his relations with Tito to be "not only normal but good," and where he launched an appeal for a rapprochement and multilateral improvement of relations with Yugoslavia, describing cooperation with and aid to Yugoslavia as a factor which "not only will contribute to an improvement in mutual relations between the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia but which will also be of advantage to all countries building socialism and communism."

Brezhnev's visit, if considered in the context of the secessionist activities applied by the Tito clique against the socialist camp, the national liberation movement, the revolutionary movements within the working class, and progressive movements in general; if considered within the context of the bilateral attempts made by N. Khrushchev and Tito to come together and coordinate their anti-Marxist activities, leaves no doubt that it reached beyond the limits of a courtesy visit laid down by diplomatic protocol. Brezhnev's journey, this "friendship mission," this "important visit"--to quote the Soviet press--reveals its strongly accentuated political and ideological nature and constitutes a link in the chain of N. Khrushchev's aims to achieve a rapprochement with the Yugoslav revisionists, to coordinate with them a new revisionist course to split the socialist camp and liquidate socialism.

It is known that N. Khrushchev publicly began seeking a rapprochement with the Yugoslav renegades in 1955 when he knelt down before Tito in Belgrade, begged his pardon for the mistakes allegedly committed by the communist and workers parties of the socialist countries against "the Yugoslav leaders," and forgave the Titoists' their sins in the name of the Soviet Union. That was the first step. Having again clothed the Yugoslav revisionists in the mask of Marxist-Leninists, Khrushchev systematically adopted one measure after another to achieve an ever closer rapprochement with them. Developments which took place after Tito's visit to the Soviet Union in 1956, particularly the counterrevolution in Hungary and the publication of the revisionist program of the League of Yugoslav Communists, put obstacles in N. Khrushchev's progress along this road. The Moscow meetings in 1957 and 1960, which justly and severely unmasked the revisionist Yugoslav clique as a traitor to Marxism-Leninism, as a saboteur of the camp of socialism in the service of American imperialism, worried Khrushchev considerably.

Because of the pressure of the just struggle carried out by the communist and workers parties against revisionism--and in particular against Yugoslav revisionism--as the main danger to the communist movement, he sometimes had to say a word against the clique of Tito. But, as always, proved by the many facts now known publicly--throughout his speeches, made at an opportune time or otherwise, Khrushchev always left the door open for an agreement with the Tito clique. He always in one way or another urged others not to worsen the relations, not to fight the Yugoslav revisionists, under the absurd pretext that it would "increase their importance."

But the time finally came, at the 22nd congress, when Khrushchev came out openly as the divider of the socialist camp and of the communist movement. At that time the first thing he had to do was to remove all obstacles and renew official state and party relations with the Tito clique. This was indispensable for the continuation of his splitting activities, and the best ally for this undertaking was obviously Tito, who had given proofs of the ways of treason to Marxism-Leninism. To achieve this aim, he had to trample the 1960 Moscow declaration underfoot; and determined upon the fulfillment of his plans, he did not hesitate to do such a thing.

Thus collaboration in the economic field began. Since 1961, trade has increased 2.5 times compared with 1955. In 1962, trade will be 30 per cent greater than last year. Last July, "in cordial talks held in an atmosphere of friendship and complete mutual understanding," all questions of mutual economic cooperation were solved without any difficulties. One after the other, various agreements were signed providing for a considerable increase in trade between 1963 and 1965 compared with the volume determined for this period by the long-term agreement in force. All measures have been taken for cooperation in the fields of industry and technical-scientific collaboration, for mutual exchanges of specialists, etc.

After solving economic questions, Khrushchev had to fully settle ideological and political questions with the Tito clique. A close collaborator of N. Khrushchev, V. Spiridonov, chairman of the Soviet of the Union of the Supreme Soviet, has said: "if one is aiming at increasing points of contact between states on questions of foreign policy, economies, and culture, then one can set upon the path of removing differences in the ideological field" (from the speech made by Spiridonov on 2 July 1962 during the reception in honor of the Yugoslav parliamentary delegation). Cooperation began to assume large proportions through the exchange of many delegations in all fields, including delegations from the political and ideological fields. The exchange of delegations comprised mass organizations such as those of trade unions, journalists, writers, artists, scientists, etc. The rumors that Khrushchev and his propagandists spread now and the on the accord of his policy and that of the Tito group were only prologues for the visit of Brezhnev.

The rapprochement with the Tito clique was made by Khrushchev statements that "Yugoslavia is a country which is building socialism." Such a mask is too transparent to hide the great treason which is being carried out in collaborating with the renegades of Belgrade.

On what basis and what logic are Khrushchev and his followers relying when they say that Yugoslavia is building socialism? How can a group of traitors to Marxism-Leninism be building socialism, when one knows that Marxism-Leninism is the scientific ideology of the construction of socialism? How can one build socialism by giving free rein to capitalist development in the country-side, by turning the economy into a capitalist economy? How can one build socialism with billions of American dollars which will strangle the entire Yugoslav economy? How can one build socialism in a country whose leaders are undermining the unity of the socialist camp? How can they be saboteurs of socialism and the builders of socialism at the same time? How can one call a country socialist whose leadership, under the pretext of a policy of nonalignment, is pursuing a line harmful to the unity of all peaceful forces and states? What changes have taken place in Yugoslavia since the 1960 Moscow meeting that enable one to arrive at such views as those of the Khrushchev group? No changes have taken place. Not only have the Yugoslav revisionists made no changes, but each day they have put themselves more deeply in the service of imperialism and have set about restoring capitalism in Yugoslavia.

The Khrushchev group needs the Tito clique for its treacherous and secessionist activities. Tito's experience in this field is useful in implementing Khrushchev's revisionist course. Therefore, he is intentionally closing his eyes to the present

situation in Yugoslavia, which is marching toward the restoration of the capitalist system; he is forgetting everything he has said against the Yugoslav revisionists. This explains all the various ideological concessions, the efforts made during the visit of Brezhnev to Yugoslavia to fit their views together.

It was not without purpose that Brezhnev, during his stay in Yugoslavia, never mentioned the words "the socialist camp" in his speeches. He was obliged not to mention them because Tito would not accept it--for he is "against all camps" and is "above camps." Another and more important reason for not mentioning these words was that he is trying to find adequate ways to liquidate the socialist camp, to introduce a wolf into the sheep pen; to admit "friendly socialist Yugoslavia" into the family of socialist countries and achieve common aims which are already known by all. This is why he avoided referring to the "socialist camp," and instead spoke about the "world of socialist countries, the "socialist forces in the world," and the "society of socialist states."

To achieve his aims of rapprochement, Khrushchev had Brezhnev accompanied by reliable support, consisting of the latter's party during his visit to Yugoslavia. This support consisted of the most reliable men closest to the Yugoslav revisionist line--Adzhubey, Firyubin, and Andropov. Adzhubey, whose only merit as a "political personality" is that he married a daughter of Khrushchev, is known as the man who, following in the steps of his father-in-law, has called the multi-millionaire president of American monopolies, Kennedy, a "hero who is the pride of the American people," and he has acted as the direct agent of Khrushchev in his transactions with Kennedy. Firyubin was ambassador in Belgrade and served as an official liaison agency between Khrushchev and the Tito clique, and he has special merits in the Tito-Khrushchev rapprochement. Andropov, former ambassador to Hungary and at present an important official in the apparatus of the CPSU Central Committee, is known as a proponent of the sinister activities of Khrushchev and his group during the events of the Hungarian counterrevolution in 1956 and in the plots of Khrushchev against the Albanian Workers Party and against the other communist and workers parties of the world.

The Khrushchev group, and Tito himself, consider that the most timely moment for a many-sided rapprochement has come, that it is now time for an open collaboration in all directions and in all forms. This was clearly expressed in Tito's speech addressed to Brezhnev: "Let us have done with insults. We must not quarrel any longer. We must be good friends." In other words, Tito said: Let us stop throwing dust in the eyes of others as if we were adversaries. Let us abandon our masks. It is time to openly extend hands and work together for our joint aims.

During his visit to Yugoslavia, Brezhnev mentioned more than once the known formula of Khrushchev on the "accord" of views and positions on questions of foreign policy. In our previous articles we have closely analyzed and proved by facts that the positions of the Yugoslav revisionists have nothing in common with the foreign policy of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries. That is why it is not necessary to deal with it at length. We will only stress that precisely when Brezhnev was touring Yugoslavia, trying to smooth out the positions and policy of the Yugoslav revisionists and present them as identical to Soviet policy, Popovic, the representative of the Yugoslav revisionists at the present session of the U. N. General Assembly, once more attacked the policy of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, comparing it with the policy of aggression and war of American imperialism.

The attempts of the Khrushchev group to equate the policies of the Yugoslav revisionists and the Soviet Union--regarding the conformity and identity of Soviet-Yugoslav positions concerning international questions--are only a bluff and a mask used by Khrushchev to present the renegade clique of Belgrade as socialist. In fact, these attempts have been refuted by many facts and by Tito himself in his recent interview when he said: "Our representatives do not always vote as the side opposing the United States.... There were cases when our representatives adopted, in accordance with our points of view, attitudes which corresponded to the positions of the American representatives."

It is no secret that Yugoslav policy in international questions follows the policy of aggression and war followed by the American imperialists, and that there can be no question of conformity with the policies of the Soviet state and the other socialist countries. The policy of the Yugoslav revisionists is fully in conformity with the news and aims of the revisionist group of Khrushchev.



It is of great importance for Khrushchev that the positions suit the strategic fundamental questions uniting the Khrushchev group with the Tito clique. These questions are: class conciliation between socialism and capitalism, political and ideological coexistence between them, peace and coexistence at any price, negation of all revolutionary movements, and the economic and political integration of the world. As for actions and positions on given concrete questions, Khrushchev himself is in many instances in contradiction with the principal policy of the Soviet state and the CPSU. In support of this there are many instances showing that Khrushchev has contradicted what he said the day before. One day he praises Eisenhower, the next day he insults him; one day he declares that the question of Germany must be settled without delay--fixing a time limit--then he declares without blushing that the question of time limits has no importance; one day he says that Yugoslav revisionism is a Trojan horse, the next he alleges that it is building socialism. This tactic constitutes one of the characteristic signs of modern revisionists: lack of principles. Like anti-Marxists--and this is what they are--they try to adapt themselves to turns caused by small political events, but they forget the vital interests of the proletariat and the nature of the capitalist order.

It was in vain that the Khrushchev group tried to give Brezhnev's visit an anti-imperialist charter and thus camouflage the real purpose of the visit--to coordinate their views and revisionist actions. IZVESTIYA, in an article entitled "In the Name of Common Objectives," which points out eagerly "the pure atmosphere of Soviet-Yugoslav relations," tried to indicate that the visit by Brezhnev would allegedly be viewed "with anxiety by Adenauer's leading circles and in general in imperialist circles."

But the truth is different. Indeed, Brezhnev was not particularly concerned with this question, and IZVESTIYA did not insist on pressing it. On the contrary, concerned lest the imperialists get angry and turn their backs on the Tito clique, the Khrushchev group particularly stressed that "the Soviet Union, desiring the expansion of good relations with Yugoslavia, is not trying to aggravate its relations with other countries." Look at IZVESTIYA of 29 September. And this is not done without a purpose; it is not in Khrushchev's interest that the Yugoslav revisionists break up with the imperialists, particularly with the U.S. imperialists. The Tito clique represents an important bridge between Khrushchev and Kennedy.

The hubbub being made these days in the United States over the U.S. Senate's decision to deprive Yugoslavia of the right of the most favored nation trade clause is not fortuitous. The truth is that the reactionary press could not hide its joy over this visit and enthusiastically described the demonstration of friendship of Khrushchev's group toward Tito as "a thaw in Soviet-Yugoslav relations."

It clearly stands out from the above that the Khrushchev group the renegade Tito gang are in accord politically and ideologically on the fundamental questions, in their tactics and their strategy with a view to a rapprochement with the imperialists; that they agree on their strategy and tactics in their struggle against Marxism-Leninism and the unity of the socialist camp, in their joint efforts to attract to treason and to corrupt certain leaders of the communist and workers parties of some socialist countries of Europe and some capitalist countries. They are in accord in their strategy and tactics aimed at undermining the national liberation movement by subjecting it to general and complete disarmament; they are in accord in their strategy and tactics for the economic and political integration of the world.

All this indicates that we are faced with a great betrayal of Marxism-Leninism. This betrayal may not be seen by those and only those who do not wish to see it, by those whose interest it is not to see it. We must look things straight in the eye, and call a spade a spade. Modern revisionism has become a very great danger to the great historic victories scored by the proletariat, to the revolution, and to socialism. It has become aggressive and shameless.

Modern revisionism, as an anti-Marxist trend, has not been completely unmasked--and precisely herein lies its dangerous character. It is true that Yugoslav revisionism has been greatly discredited, but today one must completely unmask the common front which the modern revisionists are about to create in their struggle against socialism, against revolutionary Marxism-Leninism.

Wherein lies the force of modern revisionism? We have to deal today not with an opportunism like that of the Second International during the 1894-1917 period, which relied solely on the charities given to it by the dominant bourgeoisie from



unlimited profits drawn from the exploitation of colonial and dependent peoples. The great tragedy which has struck the international communist movement today is that the revisionism is represented by the group of N. Khrushchev, who is at the head of the Soviet Union and the Communist Party of Great Lenin.

By engaging in frenzied demagoguery, the revisionists are profitably exploiting the great international authority acquired by the CPSU under the leadership of Lenin and Stalin, as well as the glorious revolutionary past of some communist parties in various countries. Modern revisionism uses Marxism-Leninism, particularly the name of Lenin, as a label to propagate its theories and anti-Marxist views, to deceive the masses. Naturally, one cannot prevent Khrushchev, Tito, and their followers from using any labels they wish in order to sell their antiquated goods; but they are dangerous when they are used by men whose mask has not been completely torn off, whose anti-Marxist faces are still hidden. V.I. Lenin continuously stressed that obvious opportunism is not so dangerous and noxious as the one which presents itself under the guise of Marxism-Leninism.

Moreover, modern revisionism also has the support of international imperialism, which is aiding it under various forms and devices, overtly or covertly. Suffice it to mention Yugoslavia, where the U.S. monopolies have given Tito, one of the leaders of modern revisionism 5 billion dollars to reach their essential objective; namely, the liquidation of the socialist system and restoration of the world hegemony of imperialism.

The source of modern revisionism was best isolated and defined at the meetings of the representatives of the communist and workers parties held in Moscow in 1957 and 1960. "The existence of bourgeois influence," the 1957 declaration stated, "is the internal source of revisionism, whereas capitulation before the pressure of imperialism is its external source."

Therefore, revisionism is not something fortuitous; it has not been brought forth suddenly as Athena. It has been born as a result of a ceaseless struggle which is taking place between the socialists--to which the future belongs--and the imperialist bourgeoisie, which is heading for doom. The capitulation of the "aristocratized" and unstable section of the representatives of the working class has been embodied in this struggle as a result of powerful and continuous pressure exerted by imperialism.

As in the past, the substance of opportunism today is the idea of collaboration between the classes. The entire activity of modern revisionism rests upon this idea. The revisionist group of Khrushchev never talks about the scientific definition of our epoch, as given in the 1960 Moscow declaration, because this grates on his ears. In this declaration our epoch has been defined as an epoch of struggle between two different social systems; an epoch of the disintegration of imperialism and the liquidation of the colonial system; an epoch of the passing on of socialism and the triumph of socialism and communism on an international scale.

Khrushchev and his followers present our time as one of peaceful coexistence during which, by peaceful means and negotiations, the social and political problems dividing the world at the moment are to be settled. To them the essential content of our time is the peaceful economic competition between the world social systems--socialism and capitalism. Peaceful coexistence was also proclaimed with much hue and cry by the Khrushchev group as the general line of foreign policy of the socialist countries, as the general road leading to the victory of socialism on a world scale. The evaluation by the Tito group of our present time, which they describe as the epoch of the peaceful integration of the world into socialism, makes the same point.

We have stressed the essential difference in meaning given to our time by the Moscow statement of 1960, on the one hand, and by the revisionists on the other hand, because it is here where the ways of revolutionary Marxism-Leninism and the modern revisionists, diametrically opposed to each other, diverge.

Proceeding from a scientific definition of our time, Marxist-Leninists draw correct revolutionary conclusions from the radical changes which have taken place in the new balance of power on the international arena, a balance which is in favor of socialism. The waxing strength of the forces of communism in the world and the strengthening of the influence of the socialist system are conceived by revolutionary Marxist-Leninists as a factor which has created most favorable conditions and new opportunities for the communist and workers

parties, for the working class and all revolutionary forces of the capitalist countries, as well as for the peoples oppressed by imperialism, for a certain victory for socialist revolutions and national liberation movements, for the triumph of socialism and communism throughout the world. But victory never falls from heaven, nobody makes you a present of it, it is gained by struggle and by the efforts of the people's masses, strongly united to a revolutionary leadership, determined to defend the interests of the people and the revolution to the end. This is the lesson of history.

Today more than ever before, the situation demands that the communist and workers parties remain always in the lead of the efforts exerted by the masses against imperialism, that they show by deeds their ability to guide the proletariat and its allies in the struggle for the triumph of the socialist revolution and the national liberation-revolution. "It is not sufficient to call oneself avant garde and be an avant-garde unit, Lenin has said. "One must also act in a way that all other units see us marching at the head and are forced to admit it." ("Selected Works," Vol. I, p. 174) The historical development of events never asks what name you bear, whether it be "Communist Party" or any other, what program and what slogan you proclaim. Revolution has no need of words but of actions. If you cannot get out of a situation by actions it will reject you; it will reject you so violently that it will damage you and nobody will give you any further consideration. There is no shortage of examples; take, for instance, our radiant reality, which shows how strongly the development of revolutionary events has condemned those who have lagged behind events as a result of their degeneration by following the revisionist course of Khrushchev.

American imperialism today represents the essential force of aggression and war; it is also the most ferocious enemy of all humanity. The world witnesses its numerous acts of aggression and war unleashed in various countries. It witnesses the feverish preparations for new aggressive wars made by the American imperialists and their partners in aggressive blocs against the socialist countries, against the peoples who have barely emerged into freedom and independence, against the peoples who rose and continue to rise with every passing day in order to free themselves from the yoke of the colonialists and imperialists and in order to liquidate the heinous régime of oppression and capitalist exploitation.

The present situation demands, more than ever and urgently, the creation of a united front for the struggle against imperialism, for peace and national independence of the socialist countries, the revolutionary workers movement in capitalist countries, the revolutionary movement for national liberation and democracy in all countries, and all peace-loving peoples, because imperialism is at present the essential and common enemy of mankind. It is only in this manner that it is possible to insure a durable peace and stave off a new world war, simultaneously liquidate imperialist domination and achieve the triumph of socialism on an international scale.

However, the creation of a strong front against imperialism is hindered by all available means by the modern revisionists. They resort to anything, even the vilest criminal actions, to sabotage the struggle for liberation of the oppressed peoples against imperialists, to prevent the union of all anti-imperialist forces struggling for peace, national independence, and socialism, and to prevent the ideas of revolutionary Marxism-Leninism from spreading and taking roots. In this respect the modern revisionists make great concessions of principle to the imperialists.

In the meantime the imperialists, mainly the American imperialists, exploit as best they can the weaknesses and concessions of the modern revisionists, particularly those of Khrushchev. The policy of antirevolutionary opportunist activity, the policy of conciliation with the imperialists which is being practiced by the revisionists, divides and weakens the socialist camp, weakens the revolutionary movement of peoples against imperialism, and allows the imperialists to strengthen their positions in various points of the world which are turned into centers of aggression against the USSR, the CPR, other socialist countries, and the liberating movements of the oppressed peoples.

In spite of savage measures and billions of dollars used by the imperialists and supported by the revisionists, in order to stifle the revolutionary and anti-imperialist movements, the revolutionary movement and the international communist movement in general spreads and grows stronger with each passing day. This could not be otherwise. Contradictions of all kinds within imperialism continuously become more serious. Today more than ever the

-Continued-

old capitalist world engenders socialist and national liberation movements. A very severe class struggle is taking place in the international arena. In more oppressed countries in Asia, Africa, and Latin America the blaze of revolutionary struggle spreads unceasingly. Even in the most advanced capitalist countries the class struggle has not ceased and will never cease, because this does not depend on the will of the revisionists or on the will of the imperialist bourgeoisie. It is being caused by objective conditions of oppression and exploitation of man by man which can disappear only with the overthrow of the capitalist regime and the installation of the socialist regime.

A certain increase, not unusual, in the production of some capitalist countries, is nothing but a phenomenon of temporary contingency, because it has not been and it cannot now be a permanent peaceful development of capitalism.

The world capitalist system is plunged into a profound general crisis; therefore, the situation of "peaceful development of capitalism" in certain countries of the world cannot continue indefinitely.

As was underlined by the Moscow statement of 1960, no attempts by imperialism can hinder the advance of society, the liquidation of the imperialist system, and the complete triumph of socialism on a world scale. This may happen more quickly or may take more time. It depends on the extent to which the proletariat and the other oppressed and exploited masses are ready and prepared to act in every respect in revolutionary situations which at present are inevitable; to the extent to which the communist and workers parties are able to prepare the masses in a many-sided manner for the revolution, to make them completely conscious, and to lead them to a complete victory over internal and external enemies. No party of the working class is able to accomplish this task if it is infected by the dangerous disease of revisionism, if revisionist leaders are at its head, if the solidarity of the world revolutionary movement, the unity of the international communist movement, and the unity of the socialist camp are not safeguarded and strengthened in the struggle against revisionism. The dissemination and strengthening of revisionism within the international communist movement not only prolongs the existence of imperialism and considerably retards the triumph of socialism in other countries, but it threatens still more seriously the victories attained by the workers masses in those countries where socialism has triumphed.

The definition of revisionism at the Moscow meeting of 1957 and 1960 as an important danger in the international communist movement, and the task set to fight and destroy revisionism to its very roots are, ideologically speaking, more topical and concrete today than ever before. The struggle against and the ideological destruction of modern revisionism has become at the moment a historically indispensable and urgent task. Revisionism not only numbs the revolutionary energy of the masses, but it finds this torpor a fertile soil for development. We note this phenomenon in countries where revisionists are at the head of communist parties, whereas Marxism-Leninism and the Marxist-Leninist parties rely on and become stronger precisely through the revolutionary energy of the masses. Therefore, by fighting revisionism and exposing its propagators, the revolutionary energy of the masses will be activated. The masses become conscious and learn to fight for their own interest, the revolution, complete national independence, democracy, socialism, and communism. Imperialism cannot be fought successfully, nor can victory over it be achieved, without fighting and exposing revisionism. Vladimir Ilich Lenin always pointed out that the struggle against imperialism becomes an empty and false phrase when it is not linked closely with the fight against opportunism.

To fight successfully against revisionism, which has become such a great danger, it should be made concretely clear to the communists and masses what revisionism is. At times, even the group of Nikita Khrushchev is compelled to say a few words about the struggle against revisionism. Definitely, the struggle against revisionism is an abstract thing without any objective for the group of Nikita Khrushchev. It is only empty phraseology. In the past, when the press and speeches of present Soviet leaders mentioned the struggle against revisionism, it could eventually be interpreted that the case referred to was that of the Yugoslav revisionists. But now that we are confronted with a fait accompli and a coordination of Khrushchev's policy with that of Tito in all fields, there is not the slightest doubt that Khrushchev's group not only fails to fight against any form of revisionism but has taken into its own hands the banner of contemporary revisionism.

In the present circumstances of the difficult class struggle between communism and imperialism, while imperialist reaction more and more joins its forces against communism, it is particularly indispensable to preserve and strengthen the unity of the socialist camp, of the communist and workers international movement. To every true Marxist-Leninist it is clear that this unity has been greatly damaged by the modern revisionists. One of the main goals of the revisionist group of Tito has always been to harm the unity of the socialist camp and the forces of international communism.

The revisionist group of Khrushchev now works against this unity through its attacks, plots, and other very vile and criminal actions against the Albanian Workers Party, other revolutionary Marxist-Leninist parties, the socialist camp, and all world revolutionary movements.

The preservation of the unity of the socialist camp and of the international communist movement, as well as the further strengthening of this unity, requires firm opposition to modern revisionism, combating and unmasking it in all its forms and in all its domains in order to fix once and for all the demarcation line with revisionism. Revisionism is a sore point in the communist movement. One must heal this wound as soon as possible in spite of the terrible pain which this operation may cause.

Once again topical today, just as in the heroic period of Marx and Lenin, is the revolutionary watchword which for more than 100 years has guided the violent class battles and the victories of proletarians and of the oppressed and exploited masses: "Workers of all countries unite." As usual today, too, this unity can be achieved only on the basis of revolutionary Marxism-Leninism, around the immortal ideas of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin, and never around the revisionists and their rotten ideas.

Even though they occupy commanding positions in a party, the modern revisionists, except for a section of privileged people who have created support for their anti-Marxist activities, are deprived of the essential support of the mass of communists; they are deprived of the workers and revolutionary peasantry, although it has become a habit with the revisionists to refer to the masses every time they want to claim that their theories and anti-Marxist doings are perfect. The mass of communists and workers are more and more aware of the great betrayal at their expense and the expense of Marxism-Leninism, and that the revisionists are renegades of communism and are beyond repair. It is precisely these masses in these historic moments who have the heavy task of saying their word, and as soon as possible to put revisionism and the revisionists in their places, because revolution and counterrevolution, Marxism and anti-Marxism, proletarian ideology and bourgeois ideology, whose creature revisionism is, cannot live together for long, neither within the framework of a party, nor within the framework of the movement as a whole.

Moreover, these communists who are wading in the mud of N. Khrushchev and who have now the possibility of more or less seeing the betrayal to Marxism-Leninism must, from now on, find the energy and the courage of stopping and detaching themselves from the revisionists.

They are faced with the alternative: either to fall in the abyss where the Khrushchev group leads, or to courageously and firmly react, uniting with the mass of the party and resolutely relying on the working masses, and deal a mortal blow to the revisionists. It is only in this way that one can help the party, the country, socialism, communism, and peace.

This is not the first time that the workers and communist movement has been faced with such a great betrayal, the betrayal of the modern revisionists. The history of the struggle of the international proletariat has sometimes confirmed that at difficult moments of a general crisis of capitalism, opportunism as the creation and agency of the bourgeoisie in its struggle and efforts to establish world domination and the oppression of the revolutionary movements of the masses.

Everyone knows very well the betrayal of the Second International and its failure, the betrayal of Kautsky, Plekhanov, Trotskiy, and their failure, the betrayal of Zinoviev, Kamenev, and Bukharin and their failure. The true Marxist-Leninists, at decisive moments of danger from opportunism, have acted firmly, have courageously risen, and have waged an uncompromising and very vigorous principled struggle against the enemies of

Marxism-Leninism. Lenin and his Bolshevik comrades, who themselves were in the midst of fires coming from several directions--from the ferocious czarist autocracy and later from the bourgeois dictatorship of Kerenskiy, from the international imperialist bourgeoisie and from the traitorous leaders of the Second International--were never afraid, but bravely defended the principles of Marxism-Leninism and drew the line between them and the Mensheviks, Trotskiyites, and so forth, in order to unite closer around the ideas of Marxism-Leninism. We know very well how the Bolsheviks acted, with Lenin in the vanguard, when they saw that there was no hope of putting the Mensheviks right and that to remain with them further in a united party was harmful and impossible. It was only by definitely eliminating the Mensheviks in 1912 that a real unity was established and it was only in this way that it became a revolutionary party, a vanguard of the entire international communist movement. In 1917, in answer to those who continued to demand the union of all Russian social democrats, Lenin wrote: There can be no question at all about a unity with the Russian social democrats. We would rather remain with two persons like Liebknecht, which would mean staying with the revolutionary proletariat, than accept even for a moment, the idea of a union with the party of the organization committee, (Mensheviks) with Chkheidze and Tsereteli.

Marxism-Leninism has always come out triumphant in the struggle against capitalism and opportunism, primarily because the Marxist-Leninists have fixed the barriers with the traitors to their proletariat, because the working class, all the classes exploited and oppressed by international imperialism and local bourgeoisie were on the side of the revolutionary communists.

The processes of unmasking isolation and the ideological destruction of modern revisionism, as a very dangerous disease within the international communist movement, has begun and is progressing with big strides. This is a dialectical process which nothing can stop. It cannot be stopped by the demagoguery of Khrushchev's group, it cannot be stopped for long by N. Khrushchev nor his admirers who abusively use the authority of the great party of Lenin. The great authority of the Soviet Union and the Communist Party of Lenin cannot be considered as the property of one or the other and even less by a group of renegades and revisionists, such as the group of N. Khrushchev.

The authority of the Soviet Union and the Communist Party of Lenin is maintained and defended not through words but through deeds, but those who firmly pursue the path of Lenin and his triumphant teachings. It is defended by the fraternal parties which struggle for the purity of Marxism-Leninism; it is defended by the Albanian Workers Party, by the Bolsheviks of the Lenin party itself, devoted to its revolutionary path. It is preserved by the communists and revolutionaries the world over.

By combating the modern revisionists, they express at the same time their love and respect for the fatherland of the October Revolution, the party and ideas of the great Lenin, which a group of revisionists tries to besmirch.

The creation of a revisionist common front--Khrushchev and Tito--their collaboration, the sharpening of arms jointly, deepens and accelerates the processes of political and ideological destruction by modern revisionism, because in their manifest and coordinated activity, the communist parties, the international communist movement, and the working class see more clearly each day the great danger which today threatens the unity of the socialist camp, the unity of the international communist and workers movement, and the unity of the progressive and peace-loving forces generally.

Therefore, profoundly persuaded of the inexhaustible revolutionary energy of Marxism-Leninism, we can say that there is no force in the world which can stop the triumphant march of ever victorious ideas.

For some decades the debate has raged whether the economy of the Soviet Union is "socialist" as it claims, or "state capitalist." Throughout the world, nations espousing rather diverse economic systems all call themselves "socialist." The definition of "socialism" is complicated by the fact that Marx was extremely vague in his description of the operation of a "socialist" economy. If one takes the yardstick "from each according to his abilities to each according to his needs," the United States becomes the most Marxist, and hence "socialist" economy in the world, since its unemployed are paid "according to their needs" a weekly sum larger than the average wage earned by working Russians (even when calculated at the official rate of exchange.)

"Ownership of the means of production" is the standard most commonly used in propaganda. The Soviet Government boasts that everything in the country is "owned by the people" or "the state." This Soviet slogan is actually a modernized ceremonial formulation of the older, more familiar, "property of the Crown," or in other words the king, who was, in effect, the state /"L'etat, c'est moi!" - Louis XIV/. It is difficult to distinguish any fundamental difference in the "ownership" of those mines and railroads which belonged to the Tsar in pre-Revolutionary Russia and to the "state" after 1917.

Current Russian explanations concerning the ownership of industry end with the state. But who owns the state? The ownership of an enterprise by a capitalist is reflected by the fact that he derives income from it. This income, called "interest" or "dividends," was also called "surplus value" by Karl Marx, who defined it as that portion of the value of the labor of the workmen which was not paid to the workman, but to someone else.

The Soviet state owns almost everything in the country. It may therefore be compared to a gigantic 19th Century capitalist corporation which has finally succeeded not only in establishing a monopoly on one product, but on all products.

It is well known that a small minority in Soviet Russia, called "The New Class" by the idealistic Communist Milovan Djilas, lives very well indeed. They can afford foreign travel, imported hunting rifles and radio-phonographs, tailored clothes, country estates and private automobiles. Moskovskaya Pravda on June 30, 1962, in an article denouncing blackmarketeers, named two rich Russians who paid the criminals 3000 new rubles (3,300 American dollars at the legal rate of exchange) for foreign radio-phonographs. This sum is equal to three years' wages for the ordinary working man! "Very few people can pay such prices" commented the newspaper. Clearly, then, this privileged minority pays for its high standard of living with funds drawn from the great corporation called the "state" which, instead of calling these funds "interest" or "dividends" calls them "bonuses," "salaries," "royalties," or often simply provides an automobile or a country house at government expense. This privileged minority is therefore living on the "surplus value" of labor defined by Marx. The members of this minority work, but no harder than the laborer who, in a letter to Sovetskaya Rossiya published October 4, 1959, complained that he had owned only one pair of shoes for the previous four years and the only reason they had lasted that long was that they were of foreign manufacture.

The privileged members of Soviet or Eastern European society - high party officials, directors and managers of giant trusts, theater managers, engineers and writers, are therefore as much the "owners" of industry as their 19th Century counterparts in Britain and the United States.

These facts are apparently obvious to many of the working people in Russia and Eastern Europe, who have coined the now famous joke: "Capitalism is the exploitation of man by man, while socialism is just the reverse!"

The rioting workers of Poznan in 1956, who scribbled "down with the rich" slogans on the walls of their "people's" factories, were seconded by the Polish newspaper Nowa Kultura on July 29, 1956, as follows:

per cent, but this increase was not reflected in the wages. The average wage was increased after 1953 by 1.6 per cent. In comparison with the year 1954 it was, however, 3.5 per cent lower later. ... Workers who overfulfilled the norm were illegally taxed 30 per cent. ... Even worse, the people's power took away from workers in these enterprises many social gains which they had to win in early years. Before the war, during the German occupation, and until 1954 work clothing was washed at the expense of the enterprise. In April 1954 this was changed to the workers... the first wage raises were in the ministries and management jobs... the beneficiaries of the wage regulations are usually not those who are badly off, but those who are receiving higher salaries in any case. The United Installation works received an additional monthly wage fund of 19,100 zloty... from it each of the three managers received a wage rise of 26.2 per cent... and the rest of the workers got a monthly raise of 4.4 per cent.

On April 5, 1956, the Budapest radio reported a listener's letter as follows:

How can the great disproportion between salaries be explained on the road leading to Socialism and Communism? ... It should not be considered right that some people earn ten times as much as others.

On April 16, 1958, the Budapest Communist newspaper Esti Hirlap, contained the following bit of news, which sounded more like a development on New York's Park Avenue than one in a "socialist" country:

Work has begun on the building in Majakovski utca of 174 luxury apartments, each to have servants' quarters....

In this same "socialist" country, the Communist Party organ Nepszabadsag, Budapest, July 8, 1962, describes appalling housing for the poor:

One family with four children lives in the bathroom of a two-room apartment which is occupied by 14 people.

The paper then blames these wretched people for coming to Budapest from the provinces in an attempt to better their living conditions. One wonders how they must have lived in the provinces!

The disparity in housing is no different in Russia, where, some years ago, the rich playwright Virta was criticized for intimidating the local Komsomol into doing unpaid "volunteer" work on Sundays on his country estate, where his pretty wife cantered about on a thoroughbred horse. She, apparently, was not one of the thousands of women which Soviet Weekly on April 25, 1957, promised eventually to relieve from their underground work in the mines! Nor can her lot be compared with that of the women who complained in a letter to Trud on March 15, 1957, about their shift boss, Pristyuk, that "he treats women workers heartlessly: he does not transfer pregnant women to light work, nor did he allow work breaks for nursing mothers."

Of more importance, perhaps, is the perpetuation of the privileged class. The elite military academies which enroll only the sons of officers and "heroes of the Fatherland War" (also mostly officers, judging from the names and ranks on the Russian War Memorial in West Berlin) ensure the hereditary nature of the Russian military caste. The requirement of tuition payments for higher education, only recently abolished, made it accessible only to the already rich and influential. Even now, the poor cannot usually spare a breadwinner for higher education and a poor youth finds it difficult to live on the allowance provided students. The impeccable political references of the sons of party officials likewise tends to make this class hereditary by facilitating their access to the privileged party schools and the diplomatic service.

The "New Class" after 40 years of "socialism" has become so conspicuous that authors have begun to use it as a theme in literature. In Continuation of a Legend, by Anatoly Kuznetsov, published in 1957,

Approved For Release 2000/08/27 : CIA-RDP78-03061A000100070008-7  
the hero, a youth in secondary school, visits a rich classmate who receives more pocket money than the hero's mother, a seamstress, can earn in a month. The author describes the confusion and embarrassment of the poor boy when he is confronted with the luxurious home of his friend and the snobbery of his mother. He develops a better feeling toward them.

The situation in the countryside is similar. Until 1861 the Russian peasant was a serf, forbidden to leave the noble's estate without permission. He had to work a certain number of days in the year for the noble. From 1861 until 1930 he was at least free to leave the estate, and many more had acquired their own land after the Stolypin reforms of 1911 before the "Revolution." With collectivization the peasant, in effect, returned to his pre-1861 position on the farm. He could not leave the estate, now renamed "collective farm" to go to live in a city, or even near a city, without an internal passport, which the lord of the manor, now renamed "Chairman of the collective farm" could refuse him. Theoretically he might move to another collective farm, though he would hardly be improving his lot by such a move, but even in this case, he must make a settlement with his own collective farm, which in effect means abandoning his only property, his half-acre private garden, which most peasants are loath to do in hungry Russia.

The position of the "lord of the manor" has worsened considerably since the "Revolution," however. If, as one did recently in Central Asia, he amasses too many automobiles, houses, and motorcycles, Moscow will very probably deal harshly with him. He also suffers from more nervous tension, due to the necessity of meeting production quotas, but this nervous tension is usually transmitted to the peasant in the form of greater pressure to work.

Occasionally a peasant will get permission to leave the collective farm, but usually only on condition that he become a colon in the Central Asian "republic" of Kazakhstan, where Russians are rapidly replacing the conquered Kazakhs, and where living conditions prompted the terrible uprising at Temir Tau in November 1959. But even this migration is not new. For centuries the peoples conquered by Russia have been Russified by a swarm of Russian immigrants fleeing bad conditions in their own country.

Basically, then, Russia is still a place where the well-born and the well-connected, are paid up to twenty times as much as an ordinary workman.



the World Socialist System

by N. S. Khrushchev

/A report on N. S. Khrushchev's article in  
Problems of Peace and Socialism No. 9 --  
 1962, by Moscow Domestic Service radio  
 in Russian on August 24, 1962/

The current issue of the theoretical journal of communist and workers parties begins with an article by First Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers N. S. Khrushchev, "Essential Questions in the Development of the World Socialist System."

The article develops the Leninist thesis on future cooperation among the socialist peoples and their merger into a single world cooperative where the economy will be directed according to a general plan. It defines the natural laws of the prolonged, complicated, and comprehensive process of putting Lenin's able prediction into practice.

Using an analysis of the contemporary situation as his basis, N. S. Khrushchev comprehensively characterizes the new stage in the development of economic cooperation among the socialist countries. The world socialist system has now approached a frontier where it is no longer possible to correctly determine prospects for its development on the basis of the simple mechanical addition of national (figures?). While strengthening in every way the national economy of each country and developing relations among them in every possible way, it is now essential to gradually promote the creation, within the entire system as such, of the single economic organism which Vladimir Ilich Lenin had in mind. It is a task of historical importance to learn to correctly exploit the advantages of socialism, which proceed from the fact of the existence of the new world system.

To fully exploit the economic laws of socialism in our time means to learn to reveal their actions, and to consider them not only within their national framework but also on an international scale. Improvement of the system of cooperation and mutual assistance has created a favorable basis for the comprehensive rapprochement of the socialist nations. It contributes to strengthening the general course of economic development while at the same time strengthening the sovereignty of each of the socialist countries, since each country acquires the opportunity in its development not only to rely on its own strength, but also on the support of the entire comity. Not to take advantage of the international division of labor in our time when, a system of socialist countries exists, would mean to deprive oneself of the opportunity to develop production on the basis of the newest achievements of science and technology.

The world socialist system, N. S. Khrushchev notes, can develop successfully only under conditions of: comprehensive cooperation by the economies of all its countries, close mutual interaction, the coordination of their efforts, and consideration of the interests of each country and the entire socialist comity as a whole. The need for more active cooperation by the socialist countries is also dictated by the need to gain the maximum time for victory in the economic competition with capitalism. The imperialist states strive to consolidate their strength in order to halt the victorious advance of socialism. Of course, one must not exaggerate the possibilities found in international imperialist associations. The unions set up by imperialists do not eliminate the deep internal contradictions and faults inherent in the capitalist world. However, not to exaggerate the enemy's forces does not mean that they should be ignored.

The article states: "We have been exposing and will continue to expose the dangerous consequences of capitalist integration for the working masses. At the same time, we consider the objective tendencies toward internationalization of production in operation in the capitalist world, and we are drafting our policy and economic

(CONTINUED)

measures accordingly. In this connection, the question arises of the possibility of economic cooperation among individual states with different social systems but also among their economic associations!"

The article stresses the basic difference in the international division of labor under capitalism and socialism. If under capitalism it is being used by the monopolies as a tool for looting people who are historically backward in their development, under socialism it graphically reflects in its content the relations of true friendship, equality, and cooperation which exist among people who are building a new life.

The division of labor, under socialist conditions, increased the pace of our progress and promotes the successful solution of economic difficulties. It aims at liquidating the economic abyss between industrial and formerly backward countries by promoting the industrialization of agrarian countries, the accelerated development of their economies and cultures, and the strengthening of the independence and sovereignty of all countries of the socialist system. The article shows that collective agreement on economic policy is not assuming particular importance in the development of the world socialist system. It is becoming the major factor of our economic cooperation.

An important role in further strengthening the social system and increasing its influence on world development will undoubtedly be played by the Moscow conference of first secretaries of central committees of communist and workers parties and heads of governments of CEMA member states, which was convened at the initiative of the PZPR Central Committee in June 1962. CEMA member states have laid a good foundation for the coordination of national economic plans. Positive results have been achieved in the joint settlement of certain important problems concerning fuel and power development, as well as the raw materials base, and in intergovernmental specialization and cooperation between the engineering and chemical industries. Proceeding from the results achieved, it is now possible to advance considerably in this important matter. Our common aim, N. S. Khrushchev writes, is to build the world socialist economy as a single entity (edinyy kompleks).

The article raises important questions on further perfecting mutually advantageous economic cooperation among the socialist countries. For instance, the question is raised about the most efficient use of funds appropriated for capital construction work and extension of the practice of jointly financing construction of industrial, transport, and other projects of international importance. The question is raised regarding trends in production specialization in each country, establishment of an equilibrium between production and consumption of the main types of production covering a period until at least 1970, and development on this basis of an overall plan for intergovernmental industrial specialization and cooperation.

The article also brings up the issue of better utilization of the system of material stimuli. One must work to achieve conditions under which economic requirements themselves, economic advantages, and the interest of each of the socialist countries serve as stimuli for an international socialist division of labor and the rapprochement of national economies.

N. S. Khrushchev writes that cooperation in production, economic rapprochement among the socialist countries, and an equilibrium in the general line of economic development will result in the fact that in the long run it may become advantageous and expedient to provide for direct outlets for commodities from some socialist countries in the markets of others. This will become one of the manifestations of the gradual erasure and overcoming of economic barriers among the socialist countries.

The article cites figures which give a picture of the further strengthening of the material-technical basis of CEMA member states. As becomes apparent from the outlines of long term plans, the industrial production of these countries between 1961 and 1980 will increase more than sixfold, agricultural produce threefold, and national income nearly fivefold.

The final part of the article describes the international influence exercised by socialist economic successes. The socialist comity, N. S. Khrushchev states, now has vast new opportunities to influence world development. We communists cannot but be elated by this. However, as internationalists, this commits us to a great deal. A truly historic responsibility falls upon the socialist countries and their Marxist Leninist parties to insure that these opportunities are used to the maximum within the framework of each country, as well as on the scale of our entire system.

THE SOVIET CAMPAIGN  
AGAINST THE EUROPEAN  
COMMON MARKET

The Soviet campaign against the European Economic Community -- the Common Market -- which began in 1957 has been stepped up in the past few weeks with the growing probability that Britain will join. It received Khrushchev's personal endorsement at the end of May when he described the Common Market as an exclusive, discriminatory alliance set up by opponents of East-West Trade and aimed against the developing countries.

The main reason for the campaign is undoubtedly Soviet anxiety about the growing economic co-operation and prosperity in Europe which will inevitably lead to a growth in world trade to the benefit of both Europe and the developing countries, thus making them less vulnerable to Communism.

The Soviet campaign has so far been addressed in the main to two audiences: first, the developing nations, which are somewhat apprehensive about the effect on them of European economic groupings, and second, Western Europe.

To both audiences the Soviet Union has put forward, as an alternative to the Common Market, a proposal to establish a world trade organisation "without any discrimination."

#### Campaign in Developing Countries

In the developing countries the Soviet aim is to discredit the Common Market by branding it as an attempt to continue the old colonial trading pattern and thus as a threat to the interests of those countries which are seeking to diversify their economies and increase their foreign currency earnings. The Common Market, it is said, will not only restrict developing countries to supplying food and raw materials to Europe, but will also lead to decreases in the prices of those materials. In his speech to the Soviet-Mali Friendship Meeting in the Kremlin on May 30 Khrushchev branded the Common Market as a "rich man's club" which was designed to tie the newly independent countries of Africa and Asia to the economy of Europe. "One of the main purposes of the Common Market is to tie the liberated countries to the economy of the imperialist States. The liberated countries are being compelled to link their fate with the Common Market and thus to retain the old, lop-sided colonial structure of their economies."

#### Campaign in Europe

In Europe the aims are to try to discourage Britain from joining, to try to convince European neutral countries that membership would be incompatible with their neutrality and to try to prove that the Common Market is an economic appendage of NATO, another vehicle for potential aggressive and revanchist aims, and in particular a platform for German aggression.

In his May 30 speech, Khrushchev declared that: "The aggressive circles of Imperialism are using it [the Common Market] with the aim of strengthening NATO and stepping up the arms race. The Common Market is also directed against the Soviet Union and other Socialist countries."

In a subsequent speech on May 31, Khrushchev described the Common Market as "potentially aggressive," and the Soviet Press and radio have developed the theme of the Common Market as a platform for German aggression. The argument is that any additional strength that Germany may gain from its membership of the European Community will be used aggressively against the East.

So far as the neutral countries of Europe are concerned, the Soviet Union has declared that the proposed association of Sweden, Switzerland and Austria is designed to enable them to be drawn into the Common Market while at the same time maintaining what *Izvestiya* on June 7 called "the signboard of neutrality." *International Affairs* in December, 1961, was quite categorical in declaring that "any form of association of the neutral countries with the Common Market will lead them to depart from a policy of neutrality," because the Common Market is the economic and political arm of NATO.

#### Economic and Social Development

Most of the Soviet assertions are refuted by the Treaty of Rome, on which the Common Market is based, and by the nature of the European Community and its economy.

The prosperity of Western Europe rests on international trade. Europe, therefore, has a natural interest in freeing world trade and raising the standards of living of the developing countries, quite apart from any humanitarian considerations. More specifically the Treaty of Rome provides that the Common Market should promote the economic and social development of its non-European associates. For this purpose the Common Market has not only opened its doors to its associates but has also operated an overseas development fund of nearly \$200,000,000 in the five years ending in 1963. This fund will be renewed for another five years and, though the total is still being negotiated, it will certainly be more than for the previous five years.

As for those non-European countries which are not associates of the Common Market the latter, as a major trading unit, has undertaken the responsibilities of co-operating in the task of helping developing countries. An important aspect of this help is the reduction of barriers to international trade so that the developing countries can sell their raw materials and manufactures more easily abroad.

If Britain joins the Common Market special measures will be necessary to safeguard the interests of the newer Commonwealth countries. Such safeguards are an important part of the negotiations now going on between Britain and the six members of the Common Market in Brussels. The broad effect of Britain's accession to the Common Market would be a lessening of the levels of preference from which other suppliers would benefit.

The extent to which the prosperity of Western Europe is bound up with the prosperity of the rest of the world is shown by figures of international trade, which is, and will remain, one of the chief sources of wealth to developing countries. In 1960, the developing countries imported goods to a total value of \$29,300 million. Of this total \$20,500 million came from the West. In the same year the developing countries exported food, raw materials and goods to the value of \$27,100 million. Of this a total of \$18,000 million went to Western countries.

In the same period the Sino-Soviet bloc exported and imported to and from developing countries goods to a total of \$2,400 million -- or 1 per cent of world trade (total Soviet foreign trade outside the bloc accounted for \$11,000 million or less than 5 per cent of world trade.)

The Soviet attempt to show the Common Market as potentially aggressive and as a platform for German aggression is unconvincing. The integration of the German economy into that of the European Economic Community as a whole will make it increasingly difficult for Germany to act independently of the rest of Western Europe. This factor operates in the same way as the incorporation of the German military forces within NATO makes it impossible for Germany to undertake any independent military action.

#### Communist Difficulties

Allied with the Soviet attacks on the Common Market have been suggestions that the Soviet Union might increase its aid to developing countries. In his speech at the Soviet-Mali Friendship Meeting on May 30, Khrushchev said: "The Socialist countries' possibilities of rendering aid to developing countries are steadily increasing." The fact is that the Communist bloc cannot meet the needs of the developing countries. Soviet offers of aid have recently run at a rate substantially lower than a year ago. At present disbursements to developing countries under Communist loan agreements are running at about \$300 million a year at a generous estimate. Western contributions from both government and private investments run at the rate of \$7,000 million a year. It is difficult to see how the Communist total could be significantly increased, since the decree announcing the recent food price increases in the Soviet Union examined all possible alternative sources for investment in agriculture and concluded that none was available.

Mr. Khrushchev's misrepresentation of Western aid in the same speech is both surprising and deplorable. After referring to the "great assistance" rendered to India by the Soviet Union in completing an iron and steel mill in Bhilai he asked: "What countries, other than Socialist countries are capable of such a step, of such disinterested help? The capitalists never give anything, not a single dollar, not a single mark, if they do not expect to make a profit."

Both the Germans at Rourkela and the British at Durgapur have built large steel mills in India, and the Western Powers have financed a large number of major industrial developments such as the Volta Dam in Ghana and the Kariba in Rhodesia.

More important is the fact that a large proportion of British, American and French aid is in the form of grants, whereas virtually all Communist aid has to be repaid, with interest, usually at 2 1/2 per cent. American economic aid to developing countries between 1946 and the end of 1961, excluding Marshall Aid, totalled about \$35,000 million. The value of Communist economic loan agreements since 1954, when the Communists began to give aid, is \$4,500 million, and actual disbursements to the end of 1961 were about a quarter of this figure. Moreover, Communist aid to developing countries is tied to procurement in those countries. In assessing the actual burden of 2 1/2 per cent interest account must be taken of Soviet Trading practices, prices and quality standard. When allowance is made for the large element of grant-in-aid, Western economic assistance is available at an overall interest rate of little over 2 per cent.

#### World Trade Organisation

In the course of his attack on the Common Market on May 30, Mr. Khrushchev proposed the establishment of a world trade organisation "without any discrimination." This is not a new proposal. The Soviet Government has for some time advocated calling a world economic conference under the auspices of the United Nations with a view to setting up such an organisation.

The last occasion when this proposal was put forward was in the United Nations General Assembly in 1961. It was then made by a number of developing countries and supported by the Soviet bloc. The revival of this idea at the present time is obviously designed to create the impression among developing countries that the Soviet Union could offer better terms for their products than the West.

In making the proposal the Soviet Union is being less than honest. It is a fundamental Soviet principle to aim at economic self-sufficiency and to avoid dependence on international trade. Indeed, in 1961, foreign trade amounted to only 3 per cent of the Soviet Union's gross national production and two-thirds of this was within the bloc.

The Soviet economic system itself is incompatible with world trade. In the Soviet Union all trade is a State monopoly which excludes consumer and customer choice. The Soviet Government alone decides what is to be bought abroad; its decisions are determined mainly by internal economic planning considerations. The liberal Western and the State-controlled Soviet bloc economic systems are so different that there would be a fundamental difficulty in drawing up practicable rules to govern trade. The non-Communist countries would be unable to secure reciprocity for the opportunities which their systems provide. Indeed, for the Soviet Union to engage in non-discriminatory international trading would require fundamental revision of the Soviet economic system, and there is no indication that this is to happen.

The Soviet proposal for an international trading organisation ignores the consistent refusal of the USSR to join international organisations which might affect its economy. It has always, for example, boycotted the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) whose members, including Britain and all Common Market members, signed a declaration in December, 1961, specifically recognising the needs for Governments to assist developing countries to export more industrial goods.

The strengthening of the European economy which the European Common Market will produce will inevitably:

- (a) provide larger European markets for the agricultural products and the new industries of the developing countries, and
- (b) generate increased capital which will be available for the development of the developing countries.

It is this success in peaceful Western co-operation that alarms the Soviet Union. One of the assets it has always counted on for success in economic competition with the West is a self-destroying scramble for markets among the capitalist States themselves. Any reduction of this asset must weaken the Soviet position and threaten not only their relations with developing countries but their entire world strategy.

Revolution in Weapons/Technology 1951-1969

Tables from Herman Kahn's book  
ON THERMONUCLEAR WAR  
Princeton University Press 1960

Table 61 TECHNOLOGY, 1951

Third or fourth generation atomic bombs  
B-50 and B-36 form backbone of U.S. SAC  
Initial production of B-47  
First flight of XB-52  
Manual air defense system started  
Air defense has F-80, F-86, F-89, F-94  
Production order for Nike A  
Range extension (aerial refueling and overseas bases)  
Nuclear-powered airplane under development  
Many organizations, in and out of government, to institutionalize  
innovation in air warfare and to rationalize research, develop-  
ment, procurement, and operation  
Russians have TU-4 and MIG-15 and have tested 3 nuclear weapons

Table 62 TECHNOLOGY, 1956

Third generation thermonuclear bombs;  
Flexible, efficient fission bombs;  
Three nuclear countries;  
Last B-47E produced;  
B-52 and KC-135 being phased into SAC;  
B-36 being phased out (last B-36J produced in August 1954);  
B-52D in production;  
B-58, Snark, and XP6M-1 (Martin Seamaster) fly;  
Regulus I, Nike-Hercules, and Falcon missiles in service;  
Atlas, Titan, and Thor in crash programs;  
Many other missile programs in progress;  
Century Series of fighters (F-100 to F-104) phased into Air Defense  
Command;  
DEW Line being built;  
MB-1 (nuclear warhead for air-to-air rockets) tested;  
Production order for Missile Master and Sage;  
U-2, Turkish radar, and other intelligence devices;  
Atomic-powered plane and rocket under development;  
Atomic-powered submarine launched;  
Research and development become major business of aircraft industry;  
procurement is secondary;  
Russians have Badgers, Bears, Bisons, IRBM's and their own model  
H bombs.

Table 63 TECHNOLOGY, 1961

Arms Control (techniques and effects)  
Experimental nuclear explosives  
Satellites (Vanguard, Pioneer, Discoverer, Tiros, Transit, Notus,  
Mercury, Echo, Convier, Ranger, Mariner, etc.)  
Soft Atlas and soft IRBM's deployed  
25 psi Atlas, 100 psi Titan, BMEWS, and Polaris being phased in  
Crash program on Minuteman and other second-generation missiles  
B-47E, B-52G and H, B-58A or B form bulk of SAC  
Airborne Command and Control  
Bombers operated alert and dispersed  
Sage and Missilemaster partially deployed  
Bomarc A and Hawk being phased in  
Nike-Hercules, F-100, 101, 102, 104 in service  
Cheap civil defense?  
Inexpensive, efficient, and versatile nuclear weapons  
There are four nuclear countries  
Goose, Navajo, Regulus II, F-108, etc., cancelled  
British cancel Blue Streak (1960), Canada cancels CF-105 (1959)  
Nuclear-powered plane and rocket still under development  
X-15 test vehicle  
Russians have . . . ?

Table 64 TECHNOLOGY, 1965

"Independent" nuclear deterrents being phased in  
Inexpensive reliable research missile (+ Commercial nuclear explosives?)  
Limits of bomb technology (if testing is continued)  
Minuteman B and Polaris C  
Second-generation Atlas and Titan  
BMEWS-B? Midas? SAMOS  
Protected B-52G and H, B-47E, B-58  
Skybolt (Airborne ballistic missile)  
Super guidance  
SAGE B, Bomarc B and C, Nike-Zeus A and B, Hawk B, F-108, B-58B,  
B-70, Dynasoar technologically possible but may be cancelled  
Antiradiation drugs  
Exotic fuels  
Nuclear-powered airplane? Rocket?  
Experimental climate control  
Bacteriological and chemical warfare  
Astronautics

Table 65 TECHNOLOGY, 1969

(Extrapolations and Breakthroughs)

Advanced satellites and primitive space ships  
Cheap simple bombs  
Cheap simple missiles  
Controlled thermonuclear reaction  
Other sources of cheap neutrons  
Other sources of nuclear fuels  
Californium bullets  
Reliable sensors  
Super calculators  
Cheap calories  
Cheap, fast transportation for Limited War  
Ground effect machines  
Reliable command and control  
Medical progress  
Advanced materials  
Disguised warfare  
Doomsday Machines